Volume of PAMPHLETS relating to the
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND versus STATE CONTROL
1837- 1840

A Parish Minister: Facts, not Falsehoods, or a Plain Defence of the Church of Scotland
Edinburgh 1846 23pp.

Letter from One of the Scotch People to the Rt. Hon. Lord Brougham and Vaux on the Auchterarder Case.
Edinburgh 1839 15 pp.

Alexander Dunlop. A Letter to the Earl of Aberdeen
Edinburgh 1840 49 pp

Earl of Aberdeen's Correspondence with Rev. Dr. Chalmers and...the Non Intrusion Comm.
Edinburgh 1840 86 pp.

John Hamilton. The Present Position of the Church of Scotland Explained and Vindicated.
Edinburgh 1840 86 pp/

Rev. N. Morren. My Church Politics
Glasgow 1842 32 pp.

Rev. Robert Buchanan. Speech on the Independence of the Church
Glasgow 1838 16 pp.

Digest of Reports of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction in Scotland. Parts II and III... Edinburgh and Glasgow established clergy and voluntary churches half of one leaf missing.
Edinburgh 1838 31 pp.

Thomas Chalmers. Conference with Members and Elders of the Church of Scotland on... the Moderatorship of the next General Assembly.
Glasgow 1837 67 pp.

Statement in Answer to Rev. Dr. Chalmers' Pamphlet of...Moderatorship by part of the Ministers and Elders... addressed
Edinburgh 1837 44 pp.

Rev. John Bruce. A Testimony and Remonstrance regarding the Moderatorship
Edinburgh 1837 17 pp

Robert Bell. Observations on the Conference of Dr. Chalmers
Edinburgh 1837 34 pp.

Thomas Chalmers. Remarks on the Present Position of the Church of Scotland
Glasgow 1839 130 pp.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/factsnotfalsehoo0000pari

Rev. Robert S. Candlish. Remarks on the Dean of Faculty's Letter to the Lord Chancellor
Edinburgh 1839. 48 pp

THE PEOPLE'S EDITION.

FACTS, NOT FALSEHOODS,

OR,

A PLAIN DEFENCE OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

SUITED TO THE TIMES.

BY

A PARISH MINISTER.

EDINBURGH:
MYLES MACPHAIL SOUTH ST. DAVID STREET.
GLASGOW: SMITH & SON, MACLEOD, AND MURRAY. GREENOCK: HISLOP.
PERTH: C. PATON. ABERDEEN: LEWIS SMITH.
LONDON: CHARLES EDMONDS.

1846.

CONTENTS.

THREE CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST THE CHURCH.

CHARGE I.—A VITIATED CONSTITUTION, p. 3.—*Non-Intrusion.*—Popular election never existed in the Church o Scotland—once condemned by Dr. Chalmers, *ib.*—The Veto—Constitution restored by Lord Aberdeen's Act—This Ac the "Boon" of Non-Intrusion Committee, *ib.*—Church has more power to prevent Intrusion *now* than in time of Veto— Drs. Muir and Robertson, p. 5.—General Assembly of 1844 refuses to settle Presentees upon reclaiming Congregations—Crot cheteers, *ib.*—Specimen of unfairness—Dr. Wardlaw's opinion of certain anti-patronage men—Other penalties beside loss o benefice consistent with the Constitution, *ib.*—Testimonies of George Gillespie and Samuel Rutherford—Dr. Burns' views April 1843—New discovery that Ecclesiastics ought to Secede when not permitted to alter the Constitution—Dr. Ward law pronounces the Constitution unchanged—Relief body of the same opinion—Testimony of Christian Observer, p. 6.—Brief Ca techism.—Ordination Vow—*Spiritual Independence.*—Absurd ideas of the Free Church on this subject—Contrary to the Confes sion of Faith, p. 7.—Independence of Established Church statutory—Advantages of this—Heterodoxy of Churches not connecte with the State—Gillespie, Rutherford, and Bailie *versus* Free Church doctrine, p. 8.—Dr. Burns beards Dr. Candlish in Glas gow—Afterwards finds his way to Tanfield—Opinion of a Popish Priest—English Independents tell Dr. Chalmers to give u Confession of Faith, or all claims to consistency—What they think of Free Church calling itself *the Church of Scotland*, p. 9.— Late Mr. Robert Wodrow's opinion—Dr. Dealtry of Calcutta subscribes to Dr. Duff's Schools, but rebukes the Seceders fo their spirit and conduct—Blasphemy—Eloquence—Anecdote from Scottish Guardian, p. 10.—The Queen our "nursing Mo ther"—Worships in Parish Church of Blair-Athol—Dr. M'Leod officiates, no innovation introduced—Jenny Geddes—Tanfield Engineers, p. 11.—Evidence of a Colonial Clergyman—Question as to Female Voters not decided in Free Church—reason of thi —Dr. Candlish approves of altering the Confession of Faith.—CHARGE II.—ERASTIANISM.—Terms explained—This charg does not apply to the Church of Scotland, p. 12.—Civil Courts cannot now interfere with her discipline—Free Church Mini ster punished by Civil Magistrate for sin, but not touched by his Presbytery—This is Erastianism—Alleged lax discipline o New Seceders—Christian Witness quoted, p. 13.—Other Testimonies—lamentable cases—"Erastian" Churches of Englan and Ireland once lauded by the party who have Seceded.—Dr. Chalmers gets a degree at Oxford—His dedication to the Lor Bishop of London, p. 14.—Presbytery of Glasgow's Address to the Archbishop of Armagh—Episcopal Church so Eulogise formerly, now "Erastian to the Core."—CHARGE III.—PERSECUTION AND SPOLIATION.—Principle of Establishments sai by some to involve persecution—Said principle well defended by New Seceders at one time—Titles of some of their works dur ing the Voluntary warfare—Duntocher Epitaph, p. 15.—Abusive language—Opinion of a stranger—Protesters not deposed o excommunicated. Leniency recommended, and shown in regard to their adherents—Plea of lunacy sustained—Absurd ideas— Expectation that Government would concede "the Claims"—Dr. Candlish's unfairness in a specific case—True state of case— Sites, though the granting of these had been opposed by the clergy, this not persecution, p. 16.—Free Church Press—no one t join in prayer with a Parish minister—Nicknames given by the Witness—Money offered to induce persons to join the Fre Church—Dr. Chalmers finds out that the Church of Scotland is a "moral nuisance," p. 17.—Abusive language of the Free Se ceders—Specimen of prayers in the Lowlands—Awful language of Free Church Ministers in Highlands—"Wine" of the Sacra ments styled "Dog's blood"—day of judgment—Clergy did not oppose sites after all—Reason of this—Conduct of landlords de fended—Evidence of an old Dissenter—Witness, "Aristocratic hearts and button-holes"—Duke of Sutherland's title to hi estates questioned.—Language of Rev. James Begg—Use of a stone in a stocking, &c., p. 18.—From 500 to 600 sites hav been granted by "Persecutors"—Persecuting spirit of Seceders—Chose sites near to Parish Church when this could be had— Glasgow an exception—This explained—Free Churches placed even inconveniently for the people, in order to be near Parish Churches—Sites refused, because not granted close to Church—Awful state of things in Highlands—Exclusive dealing—Deed of violence, p. 19.—School-house attacked—Miss Bruce nearly killed—Harvey dies of his wounds—Lieutenant Thomson, R.N. disabled—General Sir Hugh Fraser—87th Regiment—Dr. Candlish's Speech in Feb. 1844—Mr. Guthrie styles Establishe clergy "Blood Suckers"—Dr. Clason's metamorphosis—Testimony of dissenters as to *who are the persecutors*—A Dissenter' reason for joining the Church—SPOLIATION, p. 20.—Quoad Sacra Churches and Schools bound to Establishment—Case o Quoad Sacra Church near Glasgow—Debts on Churches—"Spike the guns"—Dr. M'Farlan's opinion.—CONCLUSION.—Au hor hopes that times of truth and peace may yet return.—ADDENDA—Recent dialogue between a minister of the Free Churc and a minister of the Establishment—Extracts of letters from various parts of the Highlands, showing the effects of the Secc on that once peaceful part of the kingdom.

FACTS, NOT FALSEHOODS.

The charges which have been principally instrumental in detaching members from the Establishment, and in disturbing the minds of some of its adherents, may be disposed of under the three following heads:—I. A vitiated Constitution. II. Erastianism. III. Persecution and Spoliation.

I.—THE CHURCH IS CHARGED WITH HAVING A VITIATED CONSTITUTION.

It is alleged that the Constitution has undergone such a change, that those who adhere to the present Establishment are of a different Church from that to which their fathers belonged, in which they themselves were baptized and nurtured, and of which they were members, on the morning of the 18th day of May 1843. More than this, it is alleged that the alteration has the nature of *sin* in it, so that all who seek salvation ought to quit her communion. These assertions have been made over and over again, in every parish, and the people have been told, that "if they remain in the Establishment they will be Dissenters, the Free Church being the true Church of Scotland." Now, it is evident that the grounds of the charge, that the Constitution has been vitiated, must be sought for under the head of Non-Intrusion, or Spiritual Independence; or under both these heads, comprehending, as they do, the whole matters recently in dispute between the Courts of the Church, and the Courts of the State.

1. Let us inquire if the Constitution has undergone any change in the matter of *Non-Intrusion.*

I undertake to show that the matter has undergone no change in this respect; but granting that the new Act of Parliament, *explaining* the Constitution on the subject, has made some change from what some *thought* was the Constitution, I shall prove that it has been to give greater force to the principle of Non-Intrusion, and an extension of privilege to the people.

It is a fact which no one can deny, that popular election never existed in the Established Church at any period of her history; and that it was denounced but a few years ago, by Dr. Chalmers, as a system from which he did "not anticipate a good series of appointments," appealing in corroboration of his opinion to the State of "the different dissenting bodies," and to "all history and all observation."—(*Chalmers' Works*, Vol xii. pp. 379–80.) When first courting alliance with the State, the Protestant Church, in an Assembly held in 1565, declared to the Sovereign:—"Our mind is not that her Majesty, or any other Patron, be defrauded of their just patronages, but we mean whensoever her Majesty, or any other Patron, do present any person to a benefice, that the person presented should be tried and examined by the judgment of learned men of the Church," &c. But though popular election never existed in the Church of Scotland, the *Non-Intrusion principle* was from the first asserted; nevertheless "the will of the congregation," to which it did homage, was understood to be not a blind and senseless, but a *reasonable will*, and the Constitution also express-

made to a Presentee, the matter should be brough before *the Church Courts for their judicial investigation and final determination.* The Veto was a novelty never known in the Church until the year 1834; and it is a fact, that it was opposed as such by some who have since seceded—one Reverend Doctor, in particular, maintaining, that "it put the cat to death, without giving it a decent burial." A majority of the Church, however, including many who have not seceded, approved of the Veto. They did so without narrowly examining the constitutional question it involved, but simply viewing it as a check upon patronage, which Dr. Chalmers had the candour to acknowledge had never been exercised with greater regard to the good of the people, than at the time when he undertook to modify and restrain it. Every calm and candid man must, however, on reflection, own that the Veto was an innovation, no more in the practice of the Constitution than in its theory, as set forth in the Standards of the Church. Thus, in the form of Church Government, agreed upon by the Westminster Divines, approved of by the General Assembly in 1645, and usually bound up along with the Confession of Faith, it is laid down as follows:—"No man is to be ordained a Minister of a particular congregation, if they of that congregation *can show just cause of exception against him.*

Will any honest man assert, that there is here anything to sanction the principle of the Veto, which ruled, that the dissent of a bare majority of the male heads of families, without any reason assigned, should, in every case, render a presentation null and void. All the other parishioners, male and female, and, as might possibly happen, the worthier and more intelligent part of them, might be highly satisfied with the Presentee, and regard him as peculiarly qualified to edify them. The rule, however, was made absolute: and all that was left to the Church Courts to do, was to record the decision which sealed the doom of the Presentee, unless it could be shown that corrupt practices had been had recourse to, in order to turn the balance against him.

That abuses may and will adhere to any supposable contrivance for checking Church Patronage as well as to Patronage itself, in all its conceivable forms, *popular election not excepted*, is readily acknowledged. Nor is it necessary here to argue, that the Veto, with all its liability to abuse, might not had the State sanctioned it, have protected parishes from *intrusion*, as well as many other plans. That is not the question. The question is, *Was the Veto consistent with the standards of the Church? It was not.*

According to the authority just quoted, it belongs to the people to state objections if they have any, to the person proposed to be set over them in the Lord, and it belongs to the Church Courts to *judge of the objections*, so as to sustain them or set them aside, *as they shall answer to the great Head of the Church, and to no Civil Court whatever.*

In 1649, when Patronage was abolished by Act of Parliament, and the Assembly left at full liberty to regulate everything with respect to the settlement of Ministers, it was not deemed advisable

nstitutional to denude Presbyteries of their func-
on of *judging* in the matter. For in the Directory
hich was ultimately agreed upon, the following
rovision is to be found:—"If it happens that the
ajor part of the congregation dissent from the per-
on agreed on by the Session, in that case, the mat-
er shall be brought to the *Presbytery*, which shall
udge of the same, and if they do not find their dis-
ent to be grounded on causeless prejudices, they are
o appoint a new election;" just as at present, under
milar circumstances, the Presbytery would acquaint
he Patron, so that he might look out for a new
resentee.

In the settlement of the Church which followed
he Revolution of 1688, the power of nominating to
acant charges, was conferred on the Protestant he-
tors and kirk-sessions of parishes—but it was then
gain provided, in the event of the person nominated
eing disapproved of, as follows:—"The disapprov-
's are to give in their *reasons*, to the effect the
ffair may be cognosced upon by the Presbytery of
he bounds, at whose *judgment and by whose deter-
ination the calling and entry of a particular mi-
ister is to be ordered and concluded*,"—Act 1690.

Many faithful and acceptable clergymen were in-
roduced into the Church during the time that the
ritors and elders had the patronage in their hands;
ut there is no doubt, though this has been denied,
hat the system led to heats and animosities, which
n many cases proved injurious to religion, and to
omestic as well as parochial peace. It is, besides,
eserving of notice, that it had been nicknamed
rom the first *Erastian*, by the Cameronians, or more
igid Presbyterian party.* With all its advantages
nd disadvantages the system was terminated by
Act of Parliament in 1712, when Patrons were re-
tored to their ancient rights; but the bill was not
urried through Parliament in the way party histo-
ians have recorded. Still the change was most un-
opular in Scotland. It is to be observed, however,
hat the initatory step of nomination was alone
ltered. The privilege of the people to object, and
he exclusive prerogative of the Church Courts to
udge of the reasons of objection, remained the
ame as ever, though after a lapse of years, and at a
eriod when the religious feelings of the country
ere in a comparatively stagnant state, and when
ven popular election must have failed to supply a
ure, it became the usage to consider no objections
ood, but those which referred to the doctrine, learn-
ng, or life of the Presentee.

In 1834, when the Veto was introduced, the Con-
itution was violated for the sake, as already no-
ced, of securing a practical good. Resistance, how-
ever, having been made to the *unconstitutional*, and
n the opinion of many, *unscriptural* innovation, and
he House of Lords having ultimately decided that
violated an Act of Parliament, the question arose,
hat is now to be done? In this crisis had personal
nd party feelings been disregarded, and had a para-
ount sense of the mighty interests at stake dictated
he answer, it is easy to perceive what it must have
een—namely, at once repeal the Veto law, which is
onfessedly only one of many ways of securing Non-
ntrusion, and fall back upon the old Constitutional
owers of the Church, until such time as a new ar-
angement may be made with the State. Dr. Chal-
ers, who let out, with his characteristic candour,
hat he had originally entertained some fear of the
onsequences of introducing the Veto without the
previous security of an Act of Parliament, and that
he had recommended a little patience till that should
be obtained, now naturally advocated its repeal,
which he denominated "the path of consistency and
honour."* But *no*, said other and younger counsel-
lors, and to their advice, which ultimately, as in the
days of Rehoboam, prevailed, may all subsequent
evils, including the schism, be traced. Extraordinary
to relate, it was resolved to fight the battle of Spi
ritual Independence, with the weapon of the Veto
even after it had been declared illegal. In the
course of the painful controversy which began with
this grievous blunder, doubts had in different quar
ters been expressed as to how far the Church Courts
could, in harmony with the Civil Courts, and in ac
cordance with the ancient Constitution of the
Church, prevent a Patron from intruding a Presen
tee upon a reclaiming congregation. It was in or
der to remove these doubts, and to secure to the
people of Scotland, that voice in the calling of their
ministers, to which they had an ancient right
that a bill on the subject was brought into Parlia
ment, the Secretary for the Home Department pre
viously declaring, that whatever pledge had eve
been given to the Church of Scotland, her Majesty's
Government were now prepared to redeem. Through
the blessing of Providence, the powerful opposition
which was made to this bill, *on the ground of its re
ducing the right of Patronage to all but a name*
was successfully resisted. It has now been the law
of the land, for a sufficient time to test its merits
though not to silence the reproaches of many who
had been so imprudent as to allow themselves to
be dragged out of the Church, before it came to
their relief. The Act in question confirms to the
people in the most ample manner, their ancient pri
vilege. It admits that the Church Courts are en
titled to view the objections, not merely as they are
in themselves, but in connection with the numbers
and character of those offering them, and the whole
circumstances of the parish, including, as a very im
portant element, the state of the Call. Thus, in the
event of only a few persons signing the Call, and o
multitudes objecting on grounds not *generally valid*—
that is, not good in *every* parish, but yet such as would
render the Presentee unsuitable or unedifying, and
therefore not *acceptable* in the particular parish—
then, according to the Act, the Church Courts could
without let or hindrance, give force to the objections
On the other hand, should only a few object on in
sufficient grounds, and the Call be numerously
signed, then the course of the Presbytery would be
equally clear—namely, to sustain the Call, and se
aside the objections. In short, the Act embodies
though not in his precise words, the measure of set
tlement suggested by the excellent and accomplished
Sir George Sinclair in 1842, offered by the Govern
ment, and at first declared by the Non-Intrusion
Committee to be not only admissible, but "*a grea
boon to the Church and Country*."† In consequence
of some pressure from without, the "boon" was ulti
mately rejected, by a small junto in Edinburgh, who
had the presumption to do so on their own responsi
bility, and without consulting the mind of the
Church. Upon this commenced that system and
series of proceedings which reflected honour on
none, and terminated in the Secession. I allude to
the conduct of clerical agitators intruding into pa

* Reformation Principles, p. 178. Glasg. 1787.

* "What ought the Church and the People of Scotland to d
now?" p. 46.

† See extracts from Minutes of Non-Intrusion Committee
pp. 9, 10.

rishes with which, while they remained in the Establishment, they had no right to interfere. I also allude to the scheme of a Convocation, and the various devices and influences had recourse to, in order to induce unsuspecting clergymen to bind themselves by an unconstitutional pledge. Above all, I allude to the fact of men coolly plotting the destruction of the Establishment, while they were eating its bread. What would be thought of a military commander who should continue to draw his pay, while undermining a citadel he was sent to defend? A large majority of the Clergy, however, (would it had been still larger!) chose to think for themselves, and declined shackling themselves with any vows but those which they had constitutionally taken at ordination. Hence they are now in the enjoyment of greater power to prevent intrusion than they ever possessed before. Under the protection of the law of the land, the Church Courts may now boldly give effect to any objections, except such as are excluded by express Act of Parliament. The State says to them—

"You must not reject a Presentee simply because a majority of male heads of families say, we dislike him, without assigning any reason for their dislike."

Again the State says,—

"If you dislike the law of Patronage, use the ordinary constitutional means of getting rid of it, but so long as it remains on the Statute Book you must not resist it, so as to reject a man merely because he has been presented, or has accepted a presentation."

On the other hand, the State says to Congregations,—

"If Presentees are disliked by you, because (for any reason,) you are conscientiously of opinion, they are not fitted to *edify* you, lay the case before the Church Courts, and they shall be protected, while protecting you, in every instance, from the intrusion of unedifying Presentees, however unobjectionable in point of character, learning or talents."

I should not have dwelt so much on the real meaning of the Act, as explained by its noble author —as expounded so admirably in the last General Assembly by Dr. Muir of St. Stephens, and Professor Robertson, and as given practical effect to, by that Venerable Court and its Commission in the Cases of Kircolm, Kippen, Frith and Stennis, and Banff—but for the fact, that those who have gone out from us have been at great pains to conceal from themselves and the people the truth in this matter, and that some of them have gone so far as to charge those who remain in the Church with having sacrificed the rights of the Christian people, and in the face of their ordination vows consented to a violation of the Constitution. The people are beginning to ascertain the truth in this important matter, sooner than suits the designs of the enemies of the Church. Hence the policy of the latter is, to try to multiply their adherents while excitement and delusion last; and by various expedients, to get them so deeply and publicly committed to the Free cause, as to render it very difficult for them to abandon it at any subsequent period, although their eyes should be opened.

It is true that certain *Crotcheteers*, found the charge of a vitiated Constitution on the Second Decision in the Auchterarder Case, which is to this effect, that if Presbyteries violate the law of the land, they shall be liable to civil penalties like any other class or corporation in the country; and this is moreover represented as a sinful state of thin The answer to this is sufficiently obvious,* name that *within* the statute, and under its protectio the Non-Intrusion principle can be carried in practical operations to an extent unknown even the days of the Veto.

Should the Church Courts wantonly abuse the privileges, and run in the face of a Statute intende to protect them, there can, in the nature of thing and in accordance with the principles of Protestan ism, be no good reason why they should not suff for their ill-advised proceedings.

It was formerly by many supposed, that in su a case the only penalty which the Civil Courts cou inflict was a forfeiture of the fruits of the benefic But had this been the only constitutional check, is clear, that in the poorer districts of the countr the Christian people, by being deprived of the mean of supporting a Gospel ministry among them, woul have been the real sufferers, and that a few indiv duals, such as those who had the dexterity† to effe the recent Secession, might with perfect impunit

* The Church acquiesced in the Statute, believing it to be accordance with Scripture as well as with the Constitution the Church; yet one of the common devices of the enemies the Establishment is to represent the Church as guided in h procedure with respect to the solemn act of ordination, by Lo Aberdeen's statute and not by the Word of God. Such an un fair mode of putting the case must be seen through by intell gent persons to whatever party belonging. Did not the ver persons who thus speak, petition for the Duke of Argyll's Bill Had that Bill received the sanction of the Legislature, th Church, according to her declared promise, would have regulate her proceedings so as to accord with it. In such a case, a unfair adversary might have alleged in like manner, "The Churc of Scotland is guided in the ordination of her Ministers by th Duke of Argyll's Act and not by the Word of God." It is n unworthy of notice, that some of the parties guilty of the un fairness referred to, have been all along anti-patronage me and that, not merely on the ground of expediency, but of Scrip ture. Let it suffice for the present to hand them over to D Wardlaw, who appears to know them better than they do them selves, and who thus expressed himself with respect to them month before they seceded:—"There are some among them b whom the sentiment has been avowed, that patronage is a viola tion of Christ's law for His Church, and that it is therefor essentially *sinful*. Here my charity is at a stand. I have n charity for those who can make a compromise with sin. I hav no charity for those who can retain situations which they hav obtained by *sinful* means, nor for those who can remain i fellowship with a Church where that which is sinful is constitu tionally established, and systematically practised."—*Wardlaw Speech at Aberdeen.* Edinburgh 1843.

† One of the Tanfield Seceders, addressing me on the stree of Edinburgh, during the first week of the Secession, and r ferring to it, expressed himself thus:—"We have been clever tricked," or "It has been a clever trick;" and yet this individu who seceded much against his own will, and who would undoub edly have remained in the Church had Lord Aberdeen's Bi appeared a little sooner, has since distinguished himself abusing the Establishment and all who adhere to it. More tha this, on a certain public occasion, forgetting, in his excitemen the distinction between memory and imagination, he amuse his audience, by describing, in a ludicrous manner, the way i which the Parish Minister had been extruded from the house a female belonging to the Free Church, whom he was attempting to visit. As his authority, he quoted the woman herself, without however, giving her name; but the Parish Minister, who happe to be a neighbour of my own, a mild, amiable and excellent ma has solemnly declared to me, that *the whole was a pure invention*, he having, unlike some of his brethren of the Established Church been well received in every house in his Parish, *without on single exception.* This statement was confirmed by a respectab man, an old Parishioner of my own, a member, if not a Dea of a Free Church, adjoining that of the Reverend Story-teller. He told me, of his own accord, in my own house, that having great respect for the Parish Minister said to have been so ill used, he had gone to the spot for the purpose of making inqui and had ascertained that the statement was *false from beginni to end.* In this case, I could, if called upon, have no objection to give the names of all the parties referred to, without exc ing the woman's name, which is *nonentity.*

ave virtually disestablished the Church, by sepa-
ating the temporalities from the cure of souls in
very case where, in order to carry some new project,
r punish an opponent, they should have had a mind
o to do. We find, accordingly, that in what have
een deemed the purest ages of the Church, and in
he opinion of those venerable Fathers whom all
elight to honour, something more than the mere
ithholding of the fruits of the benefice was held to
e within the power of the Civil Magistrate, accord-
ng to the constitution of the Scottish Establish-
ient. Thus it is maintained by the celebrated
eorge Gillespie, one of the Commissioners from
cotland to the Westminster Assembly, that
Church officers are to be kept within the limits of
heir calling, and *compelled*, if need be, by the
Iagistrate, *to do those duties which, by the clear
Word of God, and received ecclesiastical Constitutions
f that Church they ought to do.*"—*Aaron's Rod*, p.
76. And another of the Commissioners, the
amous Samuel Rutherford, declares in like man-
ier, "If the College of Ministers err, they are also
unishable."—*Divine Right of Presbytery*, p. 563.
With regard to the point of a pecuniary penalty, a
earned and rev. Doctor, still alive, thus expressed
imself in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, in April
843, when deprecating the threatened Secession,
r "disruption," as its authors were pleased to term
t:—"My brethren seem to think that the infliction
f a fine in the shape of damages *necessarily* implies
Erastianism. I do not think so; and Gillespie
lainly speaks as if he thought a power of the kind
ot unseasonable even in his day. And have there
een no precedents even since the Revolution?
Think, Sir, of the Abjuration Oath which for many
ears convulsed the Church, and well nigh caused a
chism. Its enforcement was sanctioned by an Act
f the Privy Council, with a penalty of L.500, and
he loss of the benefice too. Recollect, Sir, the Act
y which every Minister is still liable to a fine of
L.20, if he does not regularly pray for the reigning
Monarch and the Royal Family."—*See* Speech of
Dr. Burns of Paisley, *Glasgow Constitutional*, 19th
April 1843. *Litera scripta manet.* Upon the prin-
iples of our Free Seceders, all the faithful Minis-
ers of that period ought to have thrown up their
enefices the moment a pecuniary penalty was im-
osed; but not one of them did so. "We are all
ere unanimous," writes Wodrow, himself one of
he Recusants, "in continuing to preach till stopped
y violence."—*Wodrow's Letters*, Vol. I. p. 325.
Again, "For my part I have no peace to execute the
Erastian penalty of the Act against myself. Neither
o I know any power I have to lay down my charge
ill it be taken from me by a judicatory, or I be
orced to fly from one city to another."—*Id.* p. 333.
I resolve to keep by the dutiful exercise of my
ffice in this place, till I see the Lord in his Pro-
idence loosing me from it; and I hope the day
ill be sufficient for the evil thereof."—*Id.* Vol. II.
. 485.

And at a still earlier period, when Bishops were
ntroduced, the clergy who held Presbyterian prin-
iples did not think themselves at liberty to quit
heir cures, or cease attending the Church Courts,
ut continued contending for their principles,
hough for doing so many of them were severely
unished.

It was reserved for the superior illumination and
nproved morality of the nineteenth century to
ssert the principle, that when the clergy are
hwarted in their views, and not permitted to alter
at their will the Constitution of the Church, the
are at liberty to abandon their posts of duty, ca
their ordination vows to the winds, and charge a
who find reason to take a different view of the su
ject, with denying the Headship of the Lord Jes
Christ.

But let the charge of a vitiated Constitution
tested by the opinions of parties who belong neith
to the Established Church nor to the Free Churc
and who may be supposed to be impartial judg
or to have a leaning in favour of the New Secede
Hear, for example, the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, who
praise is in all the Churches, and who probably e
presses the opinions of the Scottish Independants-
"I think it can hardly admit of a question, that
a certain extent, if not entirely, the change has be
in them, (the Free Seceders,) not in the Constit
tion of the Establishment, or in the laws of t
country."—*See* Dr. Wardlaw's published speech,
supra, Edin. 1843.

In the organ of the Relief Church we have a te
timony to the same effect:—"The Constitution
the Church of Scotland was untouched by t
Judges, and at the time of the Secession, was t
very same as when the Seceders joined it, unless
except the changes which they themselves had fru
lessly attempted to make."—*Christian Journ*
April 1844, p. 150. In like manner, the *Christi
Observer*, an organ of the Evangelical Party in t
Church of England, while paying high complimer
to the Seceding brethren, and referring to the Co
stitution, in so far as Non Intrusion is concern
declares thus—"Total Non-Intrusion they nev
had, and the law just passed (Lord Aberdeen's Ac
gives them more than they ever before enjoyed." &
—No. lxix. p. 576.

These testimonies, coming from neutral parti
of such respectability, are valuable, and have, alo
with a multitude of similar ones, which it is qu
unnecessary to quote, had their weight with no
few who had been led away for a time by prevaili
delusions.

Before quitting this part of the subject, I beg
remark, that had the Seceding Ministers quietly d
mitted their benefices, declaring, that with the vie
they had been led to adopt, they could no long
with a good conscience remain in the Establishmer
conceding to those who thought and acted differen
the same conscientiousness which they claimed
themselves—had they done this, and been satisfi
with going forth and proclaiming a free Gosp
without wrath or reviling, they would have be
entitled, though not to the approval, yet to t
sympathy and respect of the public, and to the
most tenderness, more especially from their forn
brethren. Having, however, very generally attack
the Church with virulence, and represented
clergy as a degraded order of men, no longer wort
to bear the vessels of the sanctuary, it becomes
duty, although a painful one, to expose their ov
inconsistencies.

On this principle, I feel compelled to reman
that some prevailing misconceptions might be
moved, were certain of the Seceding brethren, mo
especially in the West, to answer a few plain qu
tions, such as the following, and to give a historic
narrative of the steps by which they were broug
into the position they unfortunately now occupy.

I. When you entered the Church, had you a
very sanguine expectation of being able to rejo
Presentees without disturbance from the Civil pow
in such cases as those that occurred in the Gene

Assembly of 1844, under the protection of a civil statute?

2. Was there no period after the struggle began, when you could have submitted to such a measure of settlement as the Church and people of Scotland now enjoy?

3. Did you never acknowledge that you could *submit* to such a measure, though you could not bring yourselves to *petition* for it?

4. Did not some of you employ means to induce the eastern leaders to lower their tone, and come over to your temperate views on this point?

5. Did not the parties referred to, prove too heavy metal for you, and deter you from taking any further steps in the direction to which you were pointing?

6. When the scheme of a Convocation was set on foot, did you not resolve to attend for the avowed purpose of counteracting the dangerous policy of the Edinburgh leaders, and propose, in the elegant figurative language of a certain Rev. rhetorical Doctor, to "*throw a wet blanket over them*?"

7. Did you not urge others, whose views you knew were temperate, to attend and co-operate with you?

8. When told that pledging would be the order of the day, did you not stoutly deny this, you having been kept entirely in the dark as to the arranged plan of operations?

9. Did you not declare, that at all events you determined to keep yourselves unfettered, so as to be at full liberty to judge of any practical remedial measure that should be introduced?

10. After you got entangled in the net which had been prepared for you, and after the Government had in their places in Parliament, and through the medium of the Home Secretary's Letter given their *final* answer, *rejecting in the most decided manner the high claims of the Convocationists, and explaining in the most distinct terms their view of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland*, and the *only* principles upon which they could ever sanction legislation for the relief of the Church—after all this, did you not desire a settlement *upon those very principles*, which have now been embodied in an Act of Parliament?

11. On the 18th of May, 1843, had none of you a lurking hope that the Lord High Commissioner would announce the measure as forthcoming? and in that case had you no idea of returning home and waiting for it, that you might form your own opinion of it, and give it at least a fair trial?

12. When you were induced to secede, was it from the fear of being denounced as having deserted your party, and broken the Convocation pledge, or for the sake of having a conscience void of offence towards God?

13. Have you never any secret misgivings when you think of the ordination vow which bound you—"to maintain the unity and peace of the Church against error and schism, notwithstanding of whatever trouble or persecution might arise, and to follow no divisive courses from the present established doctrine, worship, discipline and government of this Church, and never to endeavour, directly, or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion thereof?"

14. Do not painful feelings arise within you when you read even the heathen ode—

> Justum et tenacem propositi virum,
> Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
> Non vultus instantis Tyranni,
> Mente quatet solida, &c.
>
> An upright man, whate'er betide,
> From purpose fixt ne'er turns aside,
> Tho' unwashed mobs with frenzy, howl,
> And rabid 'Masters' stamp and scowl.

Schism, you know, is denounced in Holy Script Provided you have been guilty of it, not slight is aggravation if you have reviled a Church you ou never to have deserted, (but which can do with you, though you thought the reverse,) and if have calumniated fathers and brethren more f and more faithful than yourselves, who guided principle and not by feeling, awed by vows m sacred than a Convocation pledge, and rising ab that "fear of man which bringeth a snare," resis that pressure which bore you away.

II. Let us now inquire whether the Constitut has undergone any change in the other import matter of *spiritual independence* or *spiritual ju diction*.

Into this the controversy may be said to h merged:—Non-Intrusion and the rights of the Ch tian people came to be considered insignificant comparison with the claims of the Church, to entirely independent of the State, not only in spiritual matters, but in all matters which a ma rity of her office-bearers in General Assembly c vened, should at any time, and under any leadersh decide to be spiritual. It was mainly because State refused to grant this monstrous demand, because the Ministers, who now occupy the pa pulpits, submitted to the decision of the State, t the cry was raised, "the Church has renounced Headship of Christ;" and that they were denoun as having broken their ordination vows. These tounding assertions had the principal influence seducing many worthy people from the Churc their Fathers. But it may be safely affirmed, t had the Confession of Faith been consulted *m* and less confidence been reposed in the opinion individual Ministers, who, in the course of the l controversy, had become incapable of exercising unbiassed judgment, a very different line of se ment and conduct must have been adopted.

The Confession of Faith acknowledges the He ship of the Lord Jesus Christ over both Church State, and clearly expounds the duties of both latively to each other, as in their different sphe bound to act for the glory of their common Head

In ch. xxv. we read as follows:—"There is other Head of the Church but the Lord Je Christ."

In ch. xxx. "The Lord Jesus, as King and H of his Church, hath therein appointed a Governm in the hands of Church-officers distinct from Civil Magistrate. To these officers the keys of kingdom of Heaven [or visible Church] are c mitted," &c.

The meaning of these passages is sufficiently vious; but if, misinterpreting them, the Court the Church should, under the guidance of rash ambitious leaders, pass out of their own provi into that of the Civil Magistrate, and when chec by him, immediately raise the cry, "The Heads of Christ is interfered with," what would amount to, but to a claim of infallibility, and usur tion of Christ's Headship on the part of fallible me In virtue of that union which is established betw Christ and his people, he so identifies himself w them, as to regard offences committed against th for *bearing his likeness*, or *advancing his cause* committed against himself, and he promises to gu them by his Spirit "into all truth." What abuse of Scripture, however, would it be to i from such statements, that the visible Church

err, or that a particular Church, when violating vitiating the Constitution agreed upon with the e that established her, shall not be controlled he Civil power, which is also ordained of God? ordingly, our Confession admits that the Church err, and expressly provides a remedy through interference of the Civil Magistrate.

ch. xxv. it is written, "The purest churches under ven are subject both to mixture and error." 1 being the fact, the part assigned to the Civil istrate under the Constitution of the Church of land, and in virtue of his subjection to Christ Head of nations as well as Head of the Church, check, control, and reform the Church. In ch. i. we read, "The civil magistrate may not as- e to himself the administration of the word and aments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom leaven. Yet, he hath authority, and it is his to take order, that unity and peace be pre- ed in the Church, that the truth of God be kept and entire; that all blasphemies and heresies uppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship discipline prevented or reformed, and all the nances of God duly settled, administered, and rved. For the better effecting whereof he hath er to call synods, to be present at them, and to vide that whatsoever is transacted in them be rding to the mind of God." Every one who ot blinded by party feeling must see how com- ely the above quotations from the Confession of th, sworn to at ordination, refute the new dogma he Seceders, that "the province of the Church mply to give to the State the benefit of her ser- s, among the subjects of the realm; and that the vince of the State is simply to provide the clergy an adequate endowment." During a time of sion between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts, occurrence of irregularities and of interferences ch, in ordinary circumstances would have been gether unjustifiable, was not to be wondered at ut the Church first intruded into the Civil pro- e; and being too proud to acknowledge her r, and retrace her steps, was made to feel the sequences. (Prov. xvi. 18.)

hrough the divine blessing, however, harmony been restored, and the right of the office-bearers courts of the Church to admit to, or exclude n, sealing ordinances—and to depose ministers rding to the ancient demand of the Church "*for lawful reasons*," that is, for unsound doctrine or orality, is now not only not interfered with by Civil Courts, but protected by them, and when sion requires, enforced.

is obvious, from the nature of things, that the pendence of any Established Church must be an pendence regulated, as well as recognized, by ute; and it is well that it is so, as in this way e is under God more security for the mainten- of sound doctrine than in any Church entirely nnected with the State, and at liberty, therefore, lter her standards, and change her creed when- it seems good in her sight. To explain my ning, let us suppose a case—namely, that a ma- y of the clergy of the Establishment should be- e unsound in doctrine, denying, for example, the dship of Jesus Christ—his divinity, atonement, ther vital doctrine, and should carry matters so as to depose the orthodox minority—then if the e had nothing to do with the Church but to pro- endowments, it could take no cognizance of the tual act of deposition—and thus might every lit belonging to the Establishment become occu- pied by a heretic. But, in virtue of Chapter XXIII of the Confession of Faith, the deposed orthodox minority might lay the wrong before the Civil Magistrate, whose duty it would be to investigate the matter, and on ascertaining the fact, to eject the heretics from their benefices—to declare the orthodox minority the only ministers of the Establishment, and to protect them from all the consequences of an illegal and unscriptural deposition.

Would not Christ, the Head of the Church, be honoured by such a course of proceeding? But were the Church entirely independent of the State in spiritual things—were the Confession of Faith not embodied in the Statute-Book of the realm, and invested with all the sanctions of an Act of Parliament—had, in short, the unconstitutional claims of the seceding party been conceded by the Legislature—there could have been no remedy in the event of such a contingency as has been supposed. That the case I have hypothetically put might, under certain circumstances, be possibly realized, no one will deny who reflects that the Irish Presbyterian Church, originally an offshoot from the Church of Scotland—independent of the State in everything but endowment—and never "burdened with the yoke of Patronage" was, at one period, tainted to a lamentable extent with Arianism and Socinianism. Nor is this the only instance which can be referred to. Look to the condition of many Presbyterian Churches in England, originally founded and endowed with the view of supporting the orthodox doctrines of the Reformation, as set forth in the Westminster Confession, and in the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England—and they will be found openly avowing, kindred soul-destroying errors. I may add, that had the unconstitutional claims of the seceding party been granted, not only would there have been no human security for the continuance of sound doctrine in times of prevailing error, but an ecclesiastical tyranny might have been exercised equally odious with that of the Romish Church in the dark ages.

On this part of the subject, I shall now adduce a few testimonies similar to those with which I concluded the former topic of Non-Intrusion—testimonies, some of which may, perhaps with justice, be deemed extreme, by many in the present day, who have no sympathy with the Free Seceders in their latitudinarian notions of Spiritual Independence.

"'Tis far from our meaning," says George Gillespie, "that the Christian Magistrate should not meddle with matters of religion, or with things and causes ecclesiastical, and that he is to take care of the commonwealth, but not of the Church; certainly there is much power and authority which, by the Word of God, and by the Confessions of Faith of the Reformed Churches, doth belong to the Christian Magistrate in matters of religion."—*Aaron's Rod*, p. 181. In like manner, Rutherford maintains in regard to the Christian Magistrate, that he has "dominion as king, over men as Christians, and members of Christ's kingdom and Church; not over their consciences, (for that is proper only to the Father of Spirits,) but he hath a co-active power over all men, even pastors, so as to cause them to do their Christian duties; he hath a power to COMPEL Churchmen in assemblies to determine truth, and to use the keys right, and to preach and use the sacraments according as Christ hath commanded in his Word, and to *punish them* when they do otherwise," &c.—*Rutherford's Peaceable and Temperate Plea*, pp. 302, 334. When the long Parliament came to a vote, which allowed ap-

peals to be brought to it in matters ecclesiastical by the General Assembly, this was justly considered by the Scottish Commissioners to be unconstitutional, and a violation of the order of Christ's house. But while Principal Baillie, one of the Commissioners, disapproved of what was *apparently* intended, he guarded himself by using the following language in his correspondence:—"We are hopeful to make them declare, they mean no other thing by their appeals from the National Assembly to a Parliament, *than a complaint of an injurious proceeding, which we did never deny.*"—*Baillie's Letters*, vol. ii. p. 267. Edin. 1841.

I cannot, however, find anywhere the matter put more clearly and emphatically, than in the words of a reverend and worthy doctor, learned in the Constitution and History of the Church of Scotland, who, while deprecating the threatened secession a month before it took place, and bearding Dr. Candlish, thus expressed himself in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr:—"It appears to me that my brethren, in resolving to go out upon the high ground of spiritual independence, are doing wrong; are acting on a principle contrary to the Word of God, the Standards of the Church, and the voice of all the Protestant Reformers; are playing into the hands of the foes of all Establishments."—Again, "Is not the Christian Magistrate under law to Christ; and is not Christ carrying on his work by means of the agency of the Civil Magistrate; and is he not Head over all things to the Church?"—"You have agreed to certain standards and laws defining your united sense of the Bible. By these you must abide; and if the Civil sanction to your decrees is of any value at all, and it is the very design of an establishment to secure it, the Magistrate has a right, and it is his duty to see that you agree to the statutory regulations which are the terms of the contract."—"Bad as may have been the interferences of the Court of Session of late, I have yet to learn that any one of them occurred, except in connection with an assumed stretch of power on the part of the Church, or a vicious composition of her Courts. The Civil Magistrate may have been wrong in both, but will any man say that an interference on such grounds infers a regular control over her proceedings? These are properly the *exceptions*, and they have been comparatively of rare occurrence."—"*Our claim was extravagant, no Legislature on earth would establish and endow a Church on such principles.*"—"If conscience shall drive us out, let it be conscience duly informed, not conscience led away by certain *etherial views of the Headship of Jesus Christ*, and the irresponsibility of his Courts."—*See Synod Speech of Rev. Dr. Burns of Paisley, ut supra.*

The force of the above extracts is not, in my view, in the least degree diminished by the fact, that the worthy doctor, obviously led away by his feelings, afterwards applied for a seat in the Free Church Omnibus, though it must puzzle plain people to explain how the men of "etherial views" came to give him admission; and how his present position can be reconciled with his published opinions, which he has never, in so far as I am aware, publicly renounced. Possibly the mystery might be solved by a peep into the archives of Tanfield.

Let me now quote the testimony of a well-known Priest of the Romish Church in Ireland, who was an attentive observer of our Scottish controversy, more especially in regard to Spiritual Independence. Referring to the claims of the Seceding party, in a conversation which he had with an eminent Clergyman of the Established Church, from whom I have direct, Father ————, thus expressed himself: "By the powers, these are our very claims. We c mand that the Clergy should have all to say, a that the State should do nothing but pay."

In the Memorial of the English Independen addressed to Dr. Chalmers, they say, *inter al* "You must reject or amend the Confession of Fait Dear and honoured Sir, the truth must be told y and you must hear it. Either renounce the Co fession of Faith, or renounce your claim to cons tency. You hold that book *entire, unmodified*, a *unchanged*. Nay, you and your friends professe throughout the whole of your conflict with the Sta to have been contending simply for the doctrines the Confession of Faith. But if there is meaning language, that book is utterly fatal to your claim Spiritual Independence."—*See Christian Witne* No. iv. p. 150.

In the same document, amidst many expressio betraying much misconception with regard to t position of the Church of Scotland, as if she did n enjoy an ample Spiritual Independence, we have t following:—"Your present view of Ecclesiasti Establishments is to us most unsatisfactory. Su it is that no such Establishment has ever exist since the introduction of Christianity into the wor and we think none such ever will or can exist. T idea is original. No portion of Christian men, far as we know, ever dreamed of it."—*Id.* p. 14 "We have been daily looking for the appearance your 'claim of right' in Westminster, but have be hitherto disappointed. We hope matters may main as they are: but should such a claim be ma it will be a signal for action to the whole body of t Dissenters, both in England and Scotland. As o man, we and they will march forth to oppose y Your claim has no foundation in justice. It is equa repugnant from reason and Scripture."—*Id.* p. 14

Every one knows how difficult it is to part w old names and old associations. Hence the n denomination that has sprung up in Scotland is fo still of styling itself the *Church of Scotland*. H does the Memorial of the neutral body of Christia already referred to, deal with this matter?—"W are told," it is said in that Memorial, "that the F Church is still the Church of Scotland. Now, say that this is folly, is saying little—it is *arroga* —it is *presumption*—it is *little short of impi* Nothing can constitute any community of Christia the Church of a country, but its acknowledgme and endowment by the Government of that count The Free Church, so called, is in no respect whatev superior to the dissenting communities around it.

It must be owned that the leaders of the F Church have a difficult part to act between prese ing the old leaven of pride in their own adherer and maintaining friendly relations with their n allies, the Voluntaries. The latter have, indee shown much forbearance even when offensive la guage was used. Still they sometimes speak out, for example, in the Congregational Magazine, Gl gow, July 1845, p. 357, where they thus refer to t closing address of the Moderator of the Inverne Assembly: "The following sentence of this pu lished address appears to us indescribably silly thought." "Let it never be forgotten that we are t Church of Scotland; not, indeed, recognized as su by the State and by Courts of law, but the Church Scotland, *de jure*, and in some sense of the word *facto*, also." &c. Again is another offensive pass quoted: "Nothing can be more injurious to us th

forget the peculiarities of our character, and to ttle *down* into the state of one of the orthodox or angelical denominations of Scotland." And in a liverance of the same Assembly, the Free Church ldly revives those claims of universal dominion, hich gave such umbrage to the Voluntaries during ie exciting times of the warfare with them and of urch Extension, urging upon her adherents "to use e most strenuous exertions for the complete acmplishment of the object the Assembly has so uch at heart—the extension of the Church, and a ll and adequate provision for the religious and ucational wants of the *entire population.*"—*Monthly Statement, Oct.* 1845.

But in regard to the alleged vitiation of the Constitution, by the introduction of the Civil Magistrate to a position he never before occupied, I shall now duce the opinion of a deceased gentleman, who ld a high place among the religious public of Glasw, and was especially known for his zeal and exions in the field of Jewish Missionary enterprise. he gentleman to whom I refer, the late Mr. Wodw, had made a bequest in behalf of the favourite ject of his life, and it was proclaimed in the newspers of the new Seceders, that the Jewish Mision of the Free Church was thus to be benefited, ccording to the provisions of Mr. Wodrow's will." his led to an indignant refutation, on the part of r. Wodrow's relatives; one of whom published e following condemnation, from Mr. Wodrow's n pen, of the Convocation:—"According to our andards, the Civil and Ecclesiastical powers, though stinct, are bound to co-operate for the glory of d and the common good, and, when needful, to ercise a salutary control over each other. The solutions grant that each is responsible to God, t forbid any thing like mutual interference. The inisters who have signed these resolutions go to e State with these words, or, what is equivalent them, in their mouths: *We grant to you (the ate) the most absolute control over the temporalis, but we claim for ourselves the most entire indedndence in spiritual things. With these you have thing to do; in these we claim uncontrolled liber-* *All that you have to do, in reference to the urch, regards the giving or withholding of endowents.* Now, how totally different this is from the ctrine of the Confession of Faith, every one may by turning up chap. 23, and chap. 20, &c." Mr. odrow's relation and defender added, "He never pressed himself otherwise. He survived the Session of May 1843 several weeks, and died in conxion with the Established Church.—*See* Letter m Rev. R. Wodrow Thomson, dated July 20, d published in the *Scottish Guardian.*

An incident, somewhat similar to the above, hav- occurred in India, led to a similar exposition of ws from the Rev. Dr. Dealtry of Calcutta, long intimate associate of Dr. Duff in Missionary laurs and every good work, alike eminent for talents d Christian worth. Dr. Dealtry had subscribed o hundred rupees to the Indian Schools under Dr. ff's care, after Dr. Duff had joined the Free urch. But the liberality of Dr. Dealtry was anunced by the Free Church Committee in terms ich seemed to imply, that the Doctor approved of Secession. In a letter, therefore, which he pubhed on the occasion, Dr. Dealtry thus expressed mself:—"If it (the two hundred rupees) had not en put down in a manner calculated, as I think, mislead, I should not have troubled you on the sent occasion. I gave the promise of that sum to Dr. Duff under the express limitation that it wa for *their Schools, and for their Schools alone.* A the same time, I stated distinctly, that I had n sympathy with them in their Secession; on the con trary, I thought them decidedly wrong. I farthe stated, that, in conducting their recent proceeding there were two things so utterly inconsistent, in m judgment, with Christian principle and the spirit c Christian charity, that I considered it my duty as Christian brother to mention them to him. 1*st*. Tha I had read, when in Ceylon, with feelings of sorro and regret which I could not express, the reaso which they had assigned for their Secession, viz that the residuary body of the Scottish Church ha renounced Christ as the Head of the Church; I sai I could understand them well if they had simpl stated that they had determined to follow the for tunes of their seceding brethren at home from affec tion, sympathy, or accordance with their genera views, &c., but to allege that it was because th other party had renounced Christ as the Head, fro whom all vitality flows to the body and members knowing, as they must do, how many upright an devoted men remain, I could not understand them 2*d*, I mentioned, moreover, that I thought they ha taken a most unjustifiable step in setting up a Se cession Church in this city, and causing a schism c so painful a nature, instead of simply pursuing th Missionary objects for which they came out, an thus occupying the high ground of their appoint ment; and that if they had thus pursued their im portant labours, they should undoubtedly hav created greater sympathy in their noble undertak ings. Whether I was right or wrong in these view is not the question here, but it will prove that I di not agree with them in the principle of their Secession. I confidently appeal to Dr. Duff for confir mation of the above statements."—*Letter in Bengo Hurkura*, Feb. 9, 1844.

Large use has been made, all over the country, c the alleged vitiation of the Constitution and denia of the Headship of Jesus Christ.

The *Presbyterian Review*, irritated by the course of the General Assembly of 1844, in refusing in ever instance to settle Presentees upon reclaiming con gregations, clothed the staple charge in the follow ing language, which would, in all probability, hav been punished as blasphemy by the Civil Magis trate in a former age. "They may call themselve the National Church, and think that their founda tion is 'on the rock,' but in the name of Knox from his throne of light, we tell them, they have n right to that temple they now occupy. Its ver pedestal of plighted covenant they rent from top t bottom as they entered—it walls, so amply covere with the ensigns, of 'Royal Jesus,' they rudely de faced—its worshippers fled as they advanced—an at the *sound of their idolatrous tread, the cloud o Jehovah's presence slowly ascended from it in th sight of wondering Churches!*" July 1844.

In like manner, a leading itinerant Free orato while pursuing his vocation in a parish in the Wes thus expressed himself, and suiting the action to th words, raised and dropped his hands like the scale of a balance:—"*The Free Church says, let Jesus Chri be exalted—the Residuary Church cries, up wit Cesar, up with Queen Victoria!*"* One feels almo

* To the same purport is the following dialogue reported the Scottish Guardian, in June 1843:—"*The Voice of Warning.* On the morning after the ever-memorable 18th of May, a decen looking female of the humbler ranks of life accosted, on th streets of Edinburgh, one of our 'Westland' ministers when t

ashamed to have to deal with assertions so monstrous and disgusting, but pity can be the only feeling extended toward those who have made them.

The Queen is not the Head of the Church of Scotland at this moment, any more than she was when the Seceders sat in the General Assembly in the presence of the Queen's Representative. The Queen is not the Head of the Church of Scotland in any other sense than that she is the Church's "*nursing mother*," the very character assigned by the Prophets to royalty in the days of the Millennium. The Queen, by the oath she took on ascending the throne, is bound to protect the Church in temporal rights and spiritual independence, should either be threatened by an enemy.* Supposing, however, that the Constitution had been altered so as to admit of a greater interference with ecclesiastical matters on the part of the Queen than actually exists, it is possible that such interference might militate less against the will of Christ and the rights of the people, than the Dictatorship of a few presumptuous dominant ecclesiastics, charged neither with years nor discretion, meeting in secret conclave, and concocting all ecclesiastical matters, without consulting their fathers or brethren, except in so far as might be necessary to convert them into tools for accomplishing their purposes. Of such a state of things the Church had recently some experience, and though lamenting the loss of many good men and peaceable subjects, found some consolation in the reflection, that the metaphysicians who had misled them had migrated to another sphere, and in the confident hope that harmony between Church and State would speedily be restored, and fu collision be prevented.*

It would be wrong to insinuate, that the des of those persons were not praiseworthy at first— nothing is so intoxicating as power. By mea a blinded or enslaved majority, on which they c at all times rely, they had almost succeeded in br ing up that Church which they had sworn to de to their dying day. Had they obtained their cla and not altered their spirit, no one can tell the consequences might have been. The little ger of such, unless they had become more im with humility, meekness, and charity, would been heavier than the loins of any Sovereign of House of Brunswick likely to sway the Br sceptre. Some estimable individuals, who left beneficcs in quest of freedom, have already ack ledged, with tears in their eyes, the sadness of mistake. Εἰ δ' απιστεις, ἐρώτησόν αὐτους.—(Demo *De Corona*, cap. 16.) *i.e.* If you do not believe I say, take a quiet opportunity of asking the ge men themselves.

It would be absurd and presumptuous to main that there never could be such an interferenc the part of the Civil Magistrate with spiritual th as would justify separating from the Establi Church. In a former age, the Civil power bec persecuting, and broke through those defences which the law and Constitution of the country surrounded the Church. Such a state of things again recur, notwithstanding the better secu furnished by the Revolution Settlement and Treaty of Union. We may conceive civil ordina

following colloquy ensued,—*Woman*, 'O, Sir, are ye ane o' our ministers that cam out yesterday?' *Minister*, 'Yes, I am.' *Woman*, 'O, God bless you. How are all your brethren this morning!' *Minister*, 'Very well, so far as I know, and very happy.' *Woman*, 'I'm extraordinar glad to hear it—lang may they be sae. Do you think, Sir, that if I were to go up to Lunan I could get a word o' the Queen? She is committing a great sin, and I dinna think she kens what she's doing.' *Minister*, 'I fear you would find it very difficult to get admission to Her Majesty.' *Woman*, 'Do you think, then, that I could get in to speak to the Commissioner? Maybe he would tell the Queen my message.' *Minister*, 'I think it quite possible that you might be admitted to speak to his Grace the Commissioner.' *Woman*, 'Then I would like to speak to him on the subject, and I wish much that he would tell the Queen—for she disna ken what she's doing. She's trying to tak the crown aff Christ's head. She'll never manage that; *but she has need to tak care that they dinna tak the crown aff her ain head.*'"—The woman is supposed to have been one Bell M'Lean, from the Parish of Urquhart.

* It must be in the recollection of all, that her Majesty's Ministers were accused of rejecting the claims of the Convocationists, and of desiring the breaking up of the Presbyterian Establishment for the purpose of introducing Episcopacy, and the charge was supposed to derive weight and credibility from the Queen's not worshipping in the Parish Church of Dalkeith, or in St. Giles, Edinburgh, on occasion of her first visit to her northern dominions. How delighted would certain people have been, had the Queen, when she lately revisited Scotland, brought one of Dr. Chalmers' friends, the Bishops, along with her, and introduced him into the Parish Church of Blair-Athol, along with the organ, singing men and singing women, &c. Still more rejoiced would they have been, had her Majesty given orders to place a white surplice on Dr. M'Leod's person, and a prayer-book in his hand, the Doctor being instructed to sing or say the Litany, and the congregation to respond "Good Lord deliver us." Had this been done and submitted to, then the enemies of the Church who cry, "Raze it, raze it, to the foundation," would have had something like a reason for asserting that the Queen is Head of the Church of Scotland. But our beloved Sovereign knew her vocation better, and devoutly and unostentatiously worshipped in the Church she had sworn to defend, honouring the simple forms thereof. Had her Majesty been advised to adopt a different course—had a Puseyite Episcopalian, or an Erastian Free Churchman, been her counsellor instead of the Earl of Aberdeen, an Elder of the Church of Scotland—had it been so arranged as to introduce any innovations into the Established worship, there can be no doubt ho Minister of St. Columba, as officiating Chaplain, would acted. Nor is it unlikely, that of the band of venerable Hig matrons, who sat on the bench with snow-white caps on heads, and their bibles in their hands, and whose appearan said so much to have pleased the Queen—some one would shown by some ingenious Celtic token, consistent with th ings of respect and loyalty due to her sacred Majesty, tha fire of Jenny Geddes burns in other places besides Tanfield

* The enemies of the Church, who take the same inter her concerns which the Samaritans took in the building c second Temple, are continually predicting, that although Civil Courts have not yet interfered with her decisions i ting aside Presentees, merely because of *unsuitableness*, t just like the calm which often precedes a storm. "Be cau —mind what you are about, or the harpies of the law w upon you." Such are their apprehensions, and it is surely in them to communicate these to their former brethren. we thank them for this, we cannot help referring them somewhat parallel case, which once occurred with respect t modern invention of travelling by steam on railroads, and similar apprehensions and similar friendly warnings, turne to be quite uncalled for. There was a time, when, in c quence of the rashness and recklessness of certain con engineers, a series of collisions took place. One train o riages having gone off its own line, came into contact with ther train, the result being a fearful mutilation of limb loss of life. Those who had capital embarked in steam- and stage coaches, immediately warned the public never to set their foot within a railway carriage. For a time took the alarm. The women, in particular, refused to their countenance to the steam coaches; but by and by, e eers of greater skill and prudence, though of less prete were procured; and, under their better management, the prejudiced came to own that the railroad is the safest cheapest, as well as easiest and speediest, of all existing r of travelling. One good turn deserves another. We ther tender the following advice to our friends of the Free Ch "Take care of the engineers who conducted you to Ta We allow that they have plenty of fuel at present, and that can generate as much steam as they please. We allow they drive with a velocity truly surprising, and that no turn a corner so sharply as they—but they are dang guides; and somehow or other, when they had charge of had a constant feeling of uneasiness and insecurity, an often disturbed sleep, with the accompaniment of fearful d

be passed, as in Switzerland lately, at variance h the will of Christ, and destructive of the order his House. In such a contingency, Secession, if mitted, or suffering for conscience' sake, would the only alternatives open to his faithful ser- ts. But such a state of things has never existed ong us, nor do we perceive any symptoms of its roach. Without attempting to penetrate the of futurity, it may be confidently maintained, t never did any Church, Established or Dissent- enjoy more ample liberty for promoting the itual interests of the people, than the Church of tland enjoys at this moment.

faithful and laborious clergyman, who had been pied for ten years, and with much success, in Colonial vineyard, lately testified, on a public sion, in the author's hearing, as follows:—"I nnly declare, that during the year and a half I have been the Minister of a parish in my na- country, I have had as much liberty in preach- the Gospel to perishing sinners—in dispensing Sacraments, and in transacting the affairs of Church in her Courts, as I enjoyed while so- ning in the backwoods of America."

trust I have now satisfactorily disposed of the rge of a vitiated Constitution, and that, both regard to Non-Intrusion and Spiritual Inde- dence. It must be acknowledged, that the rge comes with no very good grace from parties, , though existing in separation from the State about three years, have not yet, after seriously osing the question, determined whether the ale sex shall vote at the election of their minis- and some of whom desiderate an alteration of Confession of Faith, for the purpose of getting of certain passages which *are felt to be standing anonies against the principles of the Free Church*, which prudential considerations in the mean- induce them to allow to remain.

II.—THE CHURCH IS CHARGED WITH ERASTIANISM.

his charge, in the sense in which the term Eras- ism has been used by the new Seceders and rs, has been already disposed of, for they under- d by it a sinful subjection of the Church to the , generally in things spiritual. It seems cer- that hundreds of the Seceding Clergy, who been lavish in affixing this stigma to the ch, never read a line of Erastus's writings. In- ch as they have ascribed to him opinions which ever held, or which, at all events, it cannot be ed that he held, it will be necessary shortly to in his views, in so far as they may be gathered his writings. Having done so, the ground of charge before us will be greatly narrowed, but matters will remain sufficiently important to fy its being taken up and disposed of under a ect head; and, in the course of the inquiry, ld it turn out that the parties bringing the ge have been themselves chargeable with the gression, or that they have been *applauding ail ing* Churches far more open to censure than hurch of Scotland, then impartial persons will a demurrer, and pronounce the accusers dis- fied for bringing the charge.

Erastus was a German physician, who flourished e era of the Reformation, and enjoyed a high tation both for learning and worth. Religion with him "the one thing needful," and theology a study to which he devoted much of his time. His views of the great doctrines and duties of Christianity were not different from those of the soundest of the Reformers. The errors into which he fell were principally, if not entirely, those which I now enumerate. He held that the functions of the Christian Ministry should be limited to the expounding of Scripture, and to the setting forth of arguments calculated to induce sinners to flee from the wrath to come, and seek reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ. He denied that there ought to be any such thing as excommunication under the dispensation of the Gospel, and maintained that Baptism and the Lord's Supper should be administered indiscriminately to all seeking such privileges, just as Circumcision and the Passover were open to the house of Israel under the law. Along with these views of the province of Christ's Ministers, and of the rights of the people, Erastus held that it was the duty of the Christian Civil Magistrate, as holding his office under Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, to manifest his subjection to Christ as Head, by punishing all open transgressions of his law. It is thus evident, that Erastus owned the Headship of Jesus Christ. His error principally lay in giving exclusively to the Civil Magistrate the oversight and punishment of scandalous persons, who ought undoubtedly, on New Testament authority, to be likewise subject to the discipline of Church Courts. In the words of the reverend and learned Dr. Lee of Edinburgh, who recently translated the Theses of Erastus from the Latin:—"The Erastian theory regards properly the question of the terms on which professing Christians should be admitted to the participation of the sacrament. It is not a theory concerning the relation in which the Civil authority stands to the Ecclesiastical, so much as regarding that in which the people of any Church stand to the Clergy primarily, and secondarily to the Civil power. It has very remote reference, if, indeed, it has any reference at all, to the great discussions which have been carried on of late in this country, as to whether it be lawful for the Civil power to interfere at all, or, if at all, to what extent in the proceedings of Ecclesiastical Courts, regarding ordination and induction of Ministers. Such a point, at least, I do not find mooted, or very obscurely, in the works of Erastus. Certainly it is no part of his main theory. So that Erastianism is a controversy not between those who hold lower and those who maintain higher notions of Ecclesiastical power, in relation to the State or Civil authority, but rather between those who entertain different views regarding the terms of admission to the sacrament."—*Lee's Preface.*

Understanding the term Erastianism in the above sense, it will be easy to show that the Church of Scotland is less deserving of that charge than those who have recently brought it against her. The Church of Scotland, in opposition to Erastus, maintains that excommunication forms part of the salutary discipline entrusted to her Courts by Jesus Christ, for the purpose of bringing sinners to repentance, vindicating his authority, and keeping pure that body of which he is Head;—that Baptism should only be administered to the children of orderly professing believers;—that the Lord's Supper should not be dispensed to scandalous persons; and that it appertains to the Church, and to the Church alone, to determine who shall be admitted to, or excluded from sealing ordinances.

These are the principles of the Church of Scotland, as ratified by the State itself, and as acted

upon by her Courts, when they faithfully discharge their duty to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Attempts have indeed been occasionally made on the part of persons conceiving themselves to have been aggrieved by the censures of the Church, to obtain the interference of the Civil Magistrate, in such a way as would Erastianise the Church, in the true sense of the word. If in a few instances, during the late unhappy collision between the Courts of the Church and the Courts of the State, the latter, departing out of the ordinary course, were induced to interfere, and, if in this way offenders did for a season escape, it may fairly be asked, had *they* no share of the blame, who by means of their majorities in the General Assembly, attempted to beard the judges and pour contempt on the law of the land? In such cases, granting with Dr. Burns, and with many who have not seceded, that the Civil Magistrate also erred, will any now assert that his interference at such a time, and under such circumstances, implied a competency or claim on his part to exercise a regular control over the proceedings of the Church Courts? "These," we say with Dr. Burns, "are the exceptions, and they have been comparatively of rare occurrence." All this is now over, but I regret to be obliged to add, that every effort has been made on the part of those who have gone out from us, to persuade the people that the Established Church of Scotland has no power to punish offenders, having surrendered it to the Court of Session. The fact is, that the Erastianism with which the Church was for a time afflicted, originated in the imprudent policy that she had been led to pursue, and took end when the Protesters descended to Tanfield. Depositions, suspensions, and excommunications have been carried to effect since that time, without any challenge from the Civil Court. I think it proper to add, that even during the time of collision, the Civil Court did, in consequence of certain specialities in a particular case which came before it, decline all interference with the discipline of the Church. The case was of importance, and served to neutralise the current allegation of the day, that the design of the Court of Session was to deprive the Church of every vestige of her jurisdiction. I am aware of one very worthy clergyman who had his eyes opened by the procedure of the Civil Court in the case referred to, and who but for that would undoubtedly have seceded. It comes in so appositely under the present head, that I shall give a very short account of it.

The Rev. Alex. Gentle, while Minister of the Parish of Alves, (now of the Free Church,) was charged before the Court of Session by a Mr. Smith, one of his parishioners, with refusing him the privilege of the sacrament, and also with slandering him from the pulpit as a swindler, in so direct and personal a manner, that every eye in the congregation turned towards him. Now, how did the Court of Session deal with the charge that had reference to Mr. Smith's exclusion from sealing ordinances? It dismissed that charge as incompetent to be tried before a Civil Court, because belonging to the proper jurisdiction of the Church Courts, independent, according to the Constitution ratified by the State, in matters purely spiritual. On the other hand, proof was allowed to be led in reference to the charge of slander. A jury was impannelled, a verdict of guilty was pronounced against Mr. Gentle, and a severe punishment followed. Here, while the Christian Civil Magistrate punished a violation of the laws of Christ, in a way that would have delighted Erastus—the conduct of the Civil Court, in acknowledging the right of the Church to excommunic would have met his high displeasure. If, on other hand, the authorities of the New Seces Church have not dealt with Mr. Gentle for crime which has brought the penalties of the Law upon him, then they have been acting Erastian principles, and to Erastus's heart's tent.

That the Kirk-Sessions of Scotland have bee times chargeable with slackness in the matte discipline, and with admitting to sealing ordina persons who ought to have been excluded, ther too much reason to fear. I believe, however, at no period in the modern history of the Ch has there been more circumspection exercised, t at present. It is to be hoped, protected as Established Church is by the State in the exe of her discipline, she will continue to administe with firmness, though with prudence and gentler and that she will never be deterred from the of duty, by the threats of scandalous person join the Free Church, or some other body of senters.

Every one must recollect, how customary it during the Voluntary warfare, to maintain, that Voluntary principle was hostile to strict discipl inasmuch as the Ministers under that system b entirely dependent on their people for the mean subsistence, were under a strong temptation wink at their sins. It was farther alleged aga them, that they sold Church privileges for mo —*Church of Scotland Magazine*, Vol. I., No. 1835.

How far such charges were correct I shall not to inquire, but, undoubtedly, to use the words Mr. Lockhart in his Address to the Synod Glasgow and Ayr in October last: "*The worst cies of Erastianism is that which compassing and land to make proselytes, augments their n bers at the expense of Church purity and salut discipline.*" And there seems to be too much reaso believe, that certain of those who took a promin part in the Voluntary controversy, and are now ceders themselves, have sunk under those tem tions to laxity of discipline, which they form alleged were inseparable from Voluntaryism.

Now, inasmuch as since they left the Church t have boastingly held themselves up to the publi patterns of faithfulness to Christ, in contrast their former brethren, it is quite legitimate to s tinise their pretensions and expose their errors. the same time, I cannot allow myself to rejoic iniquity, or to believe that there are not many n worthy Ministers of the Free Church, who reb sin as faithfully, and dispense discipline as stric as when they belonged to the Establishment.

In the Memorial to the English Independe published in the *Christian Witness*, April 1844, Church of Scotland is not very respectfully spo of, any more than the Free Church. But i affirmed, that "the Free Church presents a m awful front to the Churches planted on New T tament principles than even the Bond Chur The authority of a Deacon belonging to the Scot Independents is then quoted for the following st ment:—Their communion (that of the Free ceders) is as corrupt, even more so, than the Establishment. The evidence of a credible fession is never thought of, far less required." T is surely an over-statement. Other charges fol which I shall not insert, as they appear to be

pping a character, connected probably with irri-
n of feeling, which was not unnatural under
treatment thus described, viz., "The Indepen-
t Church here, of which I am a Deacon, while
ving the laws of Christ, have had occasion during
last year to exclude three members from their
munion, who had previously given evidence of a
want of discipleship to the Saviour. All these
e applied to the Free Church congregation here,
were immediately received into their com-
ion without the requirement of any evidence.
ile I saw it to be my duty to expose their in-
sistency in this and other matters, I was threat-
d," &c. The Memorial goes on to assert, that
abuses generally prevail in the Free Church,
warns the English Independents against en-
aging "such a corrupt institution as the Free
rch," p. 153.

aving been led to make inquiry into this sub-
I find there is too much ground for charging
a few of the Free Seceders with the Erastianism
x discipline and impure communion. In a par-
lar parish, whose name could be given, "intima-
was made on the preparation Sabbath by the
Minister, that persons from other parishes, in-
ling to communicate next Lord's day, need not
g testimonials from any of the Erastian Minis-
of the neighbourhood, as he was not disposed
ay any attention to them. Accordingly, on the
munion-day tokens were not used. The people
urged to come forward, and were told that the
ter was left entirely to their own consciences."
I have on the authority of a most respectable
yman, residing in an adjoining parish. Another,
in a different part of the country, testifies as
ws:—"Discipline, there is none among the
Seceders. Members—members—by all means,
any means, is their cry, and let us show a strong
t to the country."

he following is from a lay individual in full
munion with the Church, of the highest respect-
ity, and enjoying the best opportunities of
wing the past and present discipline of the
sh:—"The information you have received, re-
ling the effects of the secession in this parish, is
correct. Those who had been excluded from
rch privileges for years, on account of immoral
tices, were admitted to the communion of the
Church, I believe, without any exception; and
g people, whose deficient knowledge had dis-
fied them *before the Secession*, under the new
m found little difficulty of admission to the roll
s membership.

I may mention, that I have heard the Minister
in illustration of what I have stated, that being
le to credit the reports on this subject, he one
asked a respectable Seceder, whether it was the
that a certain individual, very notorious for his
ularities, had communicated at the Free Kirk?
which he replied, 'Indeed, it is too true.' And
did you feel, (said Mr. ———,) when you were
d at the same table with him? 'I did not feel
comfortable,' the worthy man replied. Why,
, rejoined his former Pastor, do not you and
rs protest against such violation of order? 'In-
, Sir, I was just saying to some of them we
ld do so.'

I have reason to believe that the same system
llowed in neighbouring parishes, and hear of
itimate children being baptized with the utmost
cy, as if the Free Church brethren were afraid
that their own elders should know of what
are about to do."

In certain parishes, persons whom no one respects, or would trust in the ordinary transactions of life—fradulent bankrupts and the like—have obtained admission to the eldership; while others, chargeable with sins which ought not once to be named among us, may be found among the most active agents of the Free Church—denouncing the Establishment as Erastian, and its Ministers as men who disown the Headship of Christ. Might it not, in these circumstances, be said in the language of St. Paul, when addressing the Church of Corinth, in reference to the INCESTUOUS person? "Your glorying is not good. Know ye not, that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out, therefore, the old leaven that ye may be a new lump." I can honestly declare, that I mention these things with very great reluctance, and would have suppressed them altogether, but for the high pretensions of the new Seceders—pretensions which have misled many, and operated most injuriously on the character and usefulness of some of the best Ministers of the Establishment.

The Church of England and the Church of Ireland, though sound in doctrine, (their Thirty-nine Articles being just our Confession of Faith in a different form,) are liable to be charged with Erastianism, in consequence of those restraints which have been imposed on their government in the matter of discipline—restraints which multitudes of pious Ministers in these Establishments deplore, and pray to have removed, yet see in them no sufficient ground for seceding, far less for joining the enemies of religion in attacking its great bulwarks. Although however, there was in the matter of discipline, and in other points, a greater approximation in the Church of Scotland to the two Episcopal Establishments than even an adversary might be supposed to allege, this would not justify the denunciations which have been levelled against our Church by men already deeply committed to an approval of those Establishments, with all their imperfections, in opposition to Churches founded and maintained on the Voluntary principle. Not many years ago, Dr. Chalmers accepted the honour of a degree from the "'Erastian Prelatic' University of Oxford." When the same eminent individual published his Bridgewater Treatise, he deemed it fitting to dedicate that admirable work to the Bishop of London in the following terms:

"TO THE

"*Right Honourable and Right Reverend*

"CHARLES JAMES,

"LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

"MY LORD.—Your Lordship's personal kindness to myself would alone have inclined me to solicit for this work the honour of your patronage and name.

"But I must further confess the peculiar satisfaction which I feel, in offering it as a tribute and a public acknowledgment of my admiration for an order of men, *who, more than all others,* have enriched by their labours the moral and the theological literature of England.

"In the prosecution of that arduous and hitherto almost unattempted theme, which the late President of the Royal Society has, by your Lordship's recommendation, assigned to me, I have derived greater aid from the views and reasonings of Bishop Butler

than I have been able to find besides in the whole range of our existent authorship.

"With this powerful aid, I commenced the high investigation to which your Lordship has called me.

"That your Lordship may long continue, by your zeal, and talents, and lofty erudition, to sustain the honours, *and to promote the vital good of our Religious Establishments in this Empire*, is the fervent desire and prayer of,

"My Lord,
"Your Lordship's most obliged
"and obedient servant,
"THOMAS CHALMERS."

"*Edinburgh, May* 13, 1833."

At the time when the Popish faction in Ireland endeavoured to destroy the Protestant Church, by depriving the clergy of their tithes and "*starving them out*," and when public sympathy was expressed by very liberal contributions from all classes of the community, the Presbytery of Glasgow, including many Reverend Doctors, now of the Free Church, unanimously voted an Address to the Archbishop of Armagh, Primate of all Ireland, in which pecuniary aid was promised with a hearty and affectionate recognition of the persecuted Irish Episcopal Church as a true branch of Christ's Catholic Church. The same reverend body complimented Lord Stanley, in very flattering terms, when he visited Glasgow, as the enlightened advocate of Church Establishments —declaring, *inter alia*, "We feel it incumbent on us to protest against the numerous and systematic attempts lately made by the enemies of our own and of the sister Establishments, to undermine and subvert those *bulwarks of our country*." "The luminous and comprehensive arguments, which were employed by your Lordship, in relation to the Irish Church, involve the recognition of principles alike honourable to your talents as a statesman, and to your knowledge of the Divine Word, which declares that righteousness exalteth a nation," &c.

It is unnecessary, I conceive, to say more upon this head. I have, I think, shewn that Erastianism, in the strict and proper meaning of the term, cannot with any fairness be attributed to the Church of Scotland. But perhaps the reader will be of opinion with me, that the parties bringing that charge against the Scottish Establishment, are scarcely entitled to be heard on the subject, inasmuch as they are themselves practical Erastians to some extent, and but a short time ago exhausted the vocabulary of praise in behalf of the Episcopal Church, which since then has undergone no change, but is now discovered by them to be "Erastian to the very core."

III.—THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IS CHARGED WITH BEING A PERSECUTING AND SPOLIATING CHURCH.

1. *Persecution.* It is well known that those who hold the Voluntary principle, in its most rigid and extreme form, conceive that all Establishments of religion embody, to a certain extent, the principle of persecution. None, however, have more valiantly combated the Voluntary principle in all its phases than those who voluntary seceded from the Church on the 18th of May 1843. But we can scarcely henceforth expect from them, as formerly, essays entitled :—

"The Principle of Establishments not essentially persecuting; that of Voluntaryism shown to be so;"* or, "Apostacy and Perjury of Voluntary Seceders." †

In vain shall we look into the Free Church Magazine, or North British Review, for articles professing to demonstrate, that it was the Voluntary principle which caused the destruction of the world by the waters of the Flood, and of the cities of the Plain by fire from Heaven.‡

Nor can we expect any new effusion of genius equal that which was exhibited in the following epitaph, penned by a clerical Free Seceder‖ for the Tomb of the Voluntary Principle, in 1841 :—

HERE LIE THE REMAINS
OF
THE VOLUNTARY PRINCIPLE,
THE PRINCIPLE, NAMELY,
THAT CHRIST HAS NO BUSINESS WITH THE STATE, AND THE STATE NO BUSINESS WITH CHRIST.

AND GOD, IN HIS MERCY GRANT, THAT IT MAY NEVER HOLD UP ITS DEFORMED HEAD, BUT MAY SLEEP IN THE GRAVE OF EVERLASTING OBLIVION, TO RISE NO MORE TILL THE GENERAL RESURRECTION;

WHEN, IF IT DO RISE, IT SHALL RISE ONLY TO BE DRAGGED FORTH TO JUDGMENT, TO BE FOUND GUILTY, AND CONDEMNED WITH THE DEVIL AND HIS ANGELS.

Constituted as human nature is, instead of being favoured again with such productions from the New Seceders, it is more probable that, in the progress of time, it will become necessary for us, to turn the weapons they so valiantly wielded in the Voluntary warfare against themselves. Meanwhile, until they as a Church, publicly disclaim their former principle and *incorporate* as well as *co-operate* with their old enemies, we are bound to suppose that they think as formerly; and, in particular, that they see no persecution involved in the principle of Religious Establishments. But it is possible that a good principle may be abused; and that Established Churches may, in particular circumstances, be found indulging a spirit of persecution towards other denominations; and this is a charge which has been frequently of late brought against the Church of Scotland. The attempts, however, to fasten this charge upon her have so signally failed, that but for the reason alluded to in the Introduction, I should have deemed it unnecessary to notice them.

The public remarked at the time that, when the Protesting minority of the General Assembly descended to Tanfield on the 18th of May 1843, no feeling but that of affectionate regret was expressed by those who did not see fit to follow them, and who, for keeping the vow, to *deliberate* and vote for the glory of God and the good of his Church, were immediately loaded with every species of abuse.§

* By the Rev. J. G. Lorimer, ex-minister of the Ramshorn Glasgow.

† By the Rev. Dr. Cunningham of Edinburgh.

‡ Church of Scotland Magazine, Vol. i. p. 253.

‖ Sermon by the Rev. W. Alexander of Duntocher. Glasgow 1841.

§ As a specimen of the self-complacency of the Free Seceders and of their power of exaggeration, take the following. "S

An Honourable Baronet from the South, who ppened to be in Edinburgh at the time when the cession took place, and was led from curiosity to sit alternately the two Assemblies, upon being ked what he thought of their comparative merits, plied as follows:—"Why, when I enter the Asnbly, where the Queen's Commissioner sits, I ar in every debate, lamentations on the part of e clergy for the loss of so many esteemed brethren; t when I visit the Seceders at Tanfield, I find em chiefly occupied with lauding themselves, and uring the vilest abuse upon their brethren, up the y, and the Church to which they so recently beged."

The Protesters were not deposed or excommunied, but after solemn prayer in their behalf, they re simply declared to be no longer ministers of e Established Church. Presbyteries were inucted to show all manner of leniency to such of ir members as should adhere to the Protest, and give them time to reconsider the matter before ally declaring the Churches vacant. In this way veral estimable ministers, who had joined the Free urch, were saved to the Establishment; and one rgyman, who pled that he had seceded while in a ate of mental distraction amounting to insanity, d his plea at once sustained.

Strange as it may appear, the fact that the Asnbly of 1843 continued to sit and transact busiss after so many of its members had seceded, was presented as a most presumptuous and cruel proeding, indicating a spirit akin to that of persecun: and even after a new Assembly, representing e completed Church, had met, the Presbyterian view asked—"What right had the Queen's Asnbly to meet and do business for a nation that it d *plundered of its right*?"

The Government had given a final answer as to e principles on which alone they could sanction islation, with the view of delivering the Church m her difficulties. That answer was deemed by e leaders, at least, to be so unsatisfactory, that parations had been going on for months all over the ntry, avowedly for the purpose of setting up a w Church, unfettered by any connexion with the ate. Still, even, after the movement down to nfield had been accomplished, there is ground to lieve that certain parties flattered themselves that ir connexion with the Establishment was not

siastic are the people there, (England,) that in one or two hs, they have been unable to restrain themselves, even amid devotions of the house of God. The simplest statement of principles, and the plainest tale of our wrongs, enlist all r sympathies. From Cornwall to the Cheviots, wherever deputations have gone, they have been welcomed and beended. It is impossible to calculate the result of such things he stone cut out of the mountain is in motion, and where will nd its resting-place?" In the same paper, the adherents of Free Church in Scotland, are denominated "*the great bulk he population, and worth of the kingdom.*" Time would fail specify the times when, places where, and persons by whom y have been estimated at a MILLION in number, and even re. This calculation is easily checked. Supposing they have places of worship, each with a congregation of a thousand, would make the trifling error on the wrong side of 300,000. where can they boast of Churches with a thousand adher-s, excepting in some of the manufacturing districts and ger towns, and even in the latter, how many of their congréions are small, and exhibiting a gradual decrease, in consence of the return to the Church of their Fathers, of members o had seceded from feeling, or respect for their ministers, or consequence of assertions in regard to the Headship of Christ, ast discovered to be without any foundation. It is not the t time that the multiplication table has been made to supere simple addition, rendering it necessary in the upshot, if th should be the object of search, to apply the humbling rule traction.

finally over. Did not some of them write to the families that they had seceded from the *Assembly merely*, and not from the Established Church? Such were soon undeceived—still it would seem to have been a pretty general expectation, that the Protest would not have been acted on by the Assembly, but that an adjournment or dissolution would have taken place. Thus, it was imagined such representations might have been made to the Government by a deputation from the Assembly, as by the Lord High Commissioner, as would have resulted in a concession of the claims, and a healing of the schism. A few years will bring strange things to light on the subject. On the other hand, a majority of the Church conceived, that the claims were such as no Government on earth could be expected ever to grant, and saw no course left to them but to proceed, reduced though they were in numbers, to transact the business for which they had met.

But passing to the proceedings of that memorable Assembly, one act was immediately laid hold of, by the principal leader of the Seceders, to represent the Established Church, as "*cut off by its own act from the communion of all Christendom.*" It is impossible to conceive greater *unfairness* than the above allegation displayed. A few words will put the matter in its true light.

In consequence of an act of Assembly passed in the year 1799, the pulpits of the Establishment have been shut against the ministers of all other Churches at least, during canonical hours. This state of things continued for many years after the high Non-Intrusion party had acquired the ascendency, so as to have power to carry any measure that seemed good in their eyes; yet no movement was made by them to open the pulpits of the Establishment to dissenters, until their own affairs were drawing to a crisis, when it was deemed prudent to conciliate their former enemies, the Voluntaries, now in a fair way of being denominated their "dear dissenting friends."

Accordingly an Act was hurriedly passed in 1844 by the very last Assembly, in which they ever deliberated, opening the pulpits of the Establishment to all and sundry that the clergy might be pleased to admit.

The Assembly of 1843, conceiving that the Act required amendment, took the matter up after the descent to Tanfield had taken place—repealed the statute of 1842, but referred the subject to a committee, upon whose report a new Act was passed by the Assembly of 1844, permitting the clergy to open their pulpits to the ministers of other evangelical Churches, having first obtained the consent of the respective Presbyteries. Thus a friendly connection with other evangelical bodies has obtained the full sanction of the Church, but with a restriction, which is a great improvement on the Act of 1842, inasmuch as it transfers the responsibility from individual Presbyters, to the Presbytery, and thus more effectually guards against abuse.

But the charge brought against the Church, having exhibited a persecuting spirit, is based more on the alleged conduct of her ministers than on the judgments of her Courts. The former have been charged again and again, with using all their influence with the landed proprietors, to prevent them from granting sites for churches to the New Seceders. Now, supposing for a little, that the clergy had acted as alleged, their conduct could scarcely in fairness have been represented as amounting to persecution. It might with more justice have been traced to self-defence—"the eldest law of nature."

Reflect, for a moment, on the language employed by the authorised organs and principal leaders of the Secession, in regard to the clergy and the Church, and we shall see no cause to express surprise, although means had been used to counteract the efforts of parties—themselves so unscrupulous—and so largely imbued with the spirit of persecution.

Of the Press embarked in the Free cause, it would be difficult to speak in language of over severity—combining, as it does, the highest pretensions to evangelical piety, with the most flagrant violation of the laws of charity, justice, and truth.

Consider the treatment which was recommended to be given to the clergy of the Established Church, as set forth in the columns of the *Witness*, a newspaper idolized by the party whose interests it professes to advocate, and to be found almost on every Free Church table. The quotation about to be given, and others which follow, are doubtless already familiar to the public eye. I again produce them, however, not because the spirit which dictated them has since improved, or because fresher quotations, equally atrocious, might not be given, but simply because they appeared *at the very time when the cry for sites had commenced, and when all who were suspected of exercising a hostile influence in the matter, were unceremoniously denominated persecutors.*

"Let the parish minister be regarded as the one excommunicated man of the district, the man with whom no one is to join in prayer; whose Church is to be avoided as an impure and unholy place; who is everywhere to be put under the ban of the community."

From the same newspaper, I select a few of the appellations it was pleased to apply to the clergy of the Establishment at the time referred to—there having since followed neither retractation nor apology:—

Atheists.	Rebels against Christ.
Chaff.	Renegades.
Dotards.	Residuaries.
Drones.	Rubbish.
Drunkards.	Slaves of Cæsar.
Enemies of God.	Stipend Lifters.*
Hirelings.	Thieves.
Infidels.	Traitors.
Liars.	Wolves.

If we chose to retaliate, we might, adopting the alphabetical order, make a long list of the so-called "martyrs to the Headship," commencing with Adulterers, of whom one has absconded, and the other been deposed. In the first case, the Presbytery slurred over the matter, for which they were pulled up by the Synod, when the Presbytery excused themselves on the ground of youth and inexperience though some of them were between fifty and sixty years of age. The other case would probably never have been heard of but for the fact, that it was discovered by the police authorities. The result was that the Reverend Free delinquent was deposed in a *room* in Edinburgh, and, of course, no notice taken of the circumstance in the *Witness*, which was engaged at the same moment in circulating upon system the most slanderous misrepresentations against the Established Church and her clergy.

Consider likewise, the *really* virulent and murderous hatred, and *affected* contempt, which the leaders of the New Secession immediately manifested towards the Church they had deserted. What said Dr. Chalmers? "The Church of Scotland is a great moral nuisance which ought to be swept away."

What did Dr. Cunningham call it? "A synagogue of Satan."

What said Dr. Candlish, the Magnus Apollo of the party?

"We are to make provision, as if the Established Church had no existence."

"The ministers of the Established Church are guilty, so far as I can see, of the very sin which would hand over the Lord of the Church, bound and fettered, into the hands of his enemies."

"The Church of Scotland is wilfully, the Church of England is ignorantly, Erastian." "Both are mountains that must be levelled, in order to make way for a free Gospel."

Dr. M'Donald pronounced the Church of Scotland to be a "God dishonouring—Christ denying—and soul-destroying Church."

Dr. Makellar maintained, that he and his friends were not occupied with setting up "a rival, but a real Church."

The language of the oracles of the Secession at its commencement was copied very faithfully by their followers all over the land; and in many cases language more indecent still was employed by the underlings of the party—those "lewd fellows of the baser sort," who were employed in various subordinate offices, knowingly contrived, for the purpose of quickening, through the medium of their vanity and self-importance, their activity and zeal.

In the low country, not a few of the Seceding clergy, in preaching their farewell discourses in their parish Churches, declared that Christ and the Gospel would retire along with them, and that those who hesitated to secede, were in danger of perishing eternally. One of their prayers was, "We pity and pray for the wretched men who minister within her polluted walls." Another, "We thank thee, O Lord! that thou hast delivered us from the chains of an Erastian Establishment—chains which were forged in hell."

In the north, the people were in many places told that "There was no efficacy in the blood of Jesus to save an adherent of the Establishment, nor could the Holy Spirit bless his own Word, preached by any of its ministers. The wine drunk at the Com-

* It is certainly very unbecoming to endeavour to hurt the usefulness of ministers of the Gospel, by affixing names to them, which imply, that worldly gain is the motive which actuates them, and not a desire to promote the spiritual welfare of their Parishioners. But seeing that this unworthy proceeding has been had recourse to on rather an extensive scale by the Ministers and Press of the Free Church, may it not fairly be put as a thing *possible*, that the promises held out to *Quoad Sacra* Ministers, Preachers, and others, led some of them to look more favourably on the invitation to secede than they might otherwise have done? As a specimen of the prospects that were set before them, take the following from the *Witness*:—"Different amounts of stipend are at present paid in the Scottish Establishment, but in the Free Church *all will be equal, all will share alike*. If, as Dr. Chalmers prophecies, the Sustentation Fund yields L.500 to each minister, all will be paid in equal proportions; if but L.150, the same division will take place. Many of the *Quoad Sacra* Ministers are at present in receipt of under L.100 per annum. If, therefore, such a one receive only L.150 from the Sustentation Fund, he will have the satisfaction of knowing that the men who have sacrificed from L.600 to L.800 per annum, are *in no better position*." No provision of a pecuniary nature is made by the Church for aspirants to the ministry. I see, however, that, in addition to travelling expenses no less a sum than L.6636, 10d., was paid in salaries to the probationers of the Free Church during the first year of the Secession.—*Monthly Statement*, No. 12.

union, in the Established Church, was *dog's blood*."
Nothing but the love of money could have induced
ny minister to remain in the Erastian Establish-
ent, and the seventh degree of heat in hell was in
tore for those of the clergy who had gone a certain
ength with the Non-intrusionists, but remained in
he Church."

The following passage is from a sermon which was
elivered in Gaelic. "On the great day, the Judge
ill ask you, whence did you come? You will an-
wer, from ————. He will then ask, did you
ign the lists which were handed about there? You
ill answer, No. He will then add, Go you to
ELL."

Now, let any calm man reflect, that it was by means
f such fearful language, that many were led, not only
o secede, but to cherish the greatest hostility to the
hurch of their Fathers; and he will own, that the
ergy would have been fully justified in using all
eir influence to counteract the efforts of the Se-
ders. The fact, however, is that they have, gene-
ally speaking, interposed no influence whatever,
nder the conviction that a system so hollow in its
undations, and supported by such unprincipled
eans, could not long find favour with any consi-
erable portion of the intelligent and religious peo-
le of Scotland, or permanently alienate them from
e Church of their Fathers. In their public mi-
istrations, they have rarely alluded to their former
rethren, except to comprehend them along with
her dissenters, in the usual catholic prayer for
hristians of all denominations. On many trying
casions, they have been enabled to possess their
uls in patience, and not to return railing for rail-
g, but contrariwise blessing. Sometimes the pa-
h Minister, on being denied admission into the
ouse, has prayed for the deluded people under the
pen canopy of heaven. This occurred even in the
w country, and within the bounds of the well-
nown Presbytery of Paisley.

"I shall never forget," writes an esteemed cor-
espondent, "the shudder I felt in the great Hall
Glasgow—crowded to excess—when a nume-
us platform of venerable divines, and the vast mul-
tude before them, united their exulting approval
one terrible laugh, as the young men were asked,
hat they would feel, should they see their mother
drivelling old age, having outlived her usefulness?
Would they not rather see her in her grave? And
w, what of the Old Erastian Church—would they
t bury her out of their sight? For this Hindoo
orality, instilled into the minds of the rising gene-
tion, the unhappy orator was not alone responsible
but for it all who swelled that tumultuous sound in
e ear of Him, who was once a Man of Sorrows,
ust give an account in that day when he shall ap-
ar in his glory. And, alas, how often has the
me spirit been manifested elsewhere! how often
ve the people assembled in the house of God, been
cited to merriment, rather than to praise and
ayer!"

In regard to sites for the Free Churches, it seems
ubtful if the Clergy interfered at all. Several
re accused of having done so, but a contradiction
the most satisfactory nature soon followed. That
e landed proprietors of Scotland being, generally
eaking, members of the Established Church, or
rmly attached to that institution, were, under
y moral obligation to grant sites for Churches to
ect that breathed hostility to the Establishment,
d of whose principles, spirit, and conduct they
tirely disapproved, no person of a dispassionate
mind would venture to maintain. On this point, t
opinion of the old dissenters may be supposed to
impartial, and deserving of respect. Let the follo
ing suffice:—"I confess my mind is so constitute
that I cannot set it down to the account of persec
tion, that any proprietor of land should not exact
choose to part with his property at the bidding
the Free Church, and to have it applied to purpos
which he himself condemns. I wonder if —— ——
possessed a piece of land contiguous to his own Fr
Church, he would be disposed to supply a portion
it upon which to build a new Church in connectio
with the Establishment, or if his Free Churc
friends would regard his refusal as persecution?
rather suspect not."—*See Relief Magazine*, vol. v
p. 167.

That the landed proprietors had reason to fe
somewhat jealous of the Free Church, and that the
was little need for the Clergy to warn them of t
possible consequences of encouraging the Seceder
few will deny. It was in the following terms tha
the *Witness* expressed itself, in regard to the arist
cracy, and the fate impending them:—"There a
terrible instruments of vengeance in the countr
If God avert not the omen, we may yet see huma
entrails paraded on poles through the streets, ar
slices of aristocratic hearts dangling at our butto
holes."

Notwithstanding such ferocious language, worth
of the fiends of the French Revolution, and no
withstanding the alleged hostile influence of t
Clergy, the fact is, that the landlords, general
speaking, granted sites, though sometimes stipula
ing that they should be at a little distance from t
parish Church—a condition to which many demu
red. Consider, that in the same journal, doub
were expressed as to the title of the Duke of S
therland to his extensive estates. It was state
that, in the opinion of a lawyer of eminence, t
inhabitants of Sutherland had a better right to th
land than his Grace, and that a time might com
when those who were now denied sites for the
Churches would be proprietors of the soil. The fo
lowing revolutionary threat, I regret to say, w
uttered by one of the clerical agitators, the Re
James Begg:—"*The Duke and all others must gi
way. They are welcome to fall or come down
softly as they please, from the bad eminence on whi
they have placed themselves, but they must clear
and unequivocally come down, or be driven down*
—*Edinburgh Post*, Dec. 2, 1843.

The following atrocious tirade was actually u
tered by a clerical agitator of the North, in a di
course from the pulpit, shortly before the Secessio
of 1843:—"There was a time when the people
Britain brought a King to the block for opposi
them in religious matters, and I do not see any re
son why the same thing might not be done to
Queen. But some of you will say, What can I do
I am but a poor old man, or a poor old woman, a
can do nothing. *Cannot any of you put a sto
in a stocking and use it?*" Surely, any one callin
himself a minister of the Gospel, who so addresse
his people, was more deserving of being accomm
dated with a prison for his person, than with a si
for his Church. More recently, another of the sa
kidney declared from the pulpit, that "Queen V
toria was a perjured woman, and had no more rig
to the throne than an old woman, in his eye,
whom he pointed. Allegiance was no longer a dut
The honest man who heard this treason, offered
make affidavit as above, before the sheriff of a coun

who mentioned the fact to a clergyman from whom I have it. Altogether, it would appear, that from 500 to 600 sites have been procured, and, generally speaking, from parties opposed to the principles of the Free Church, a fact of itself sufficient to disprove the charge of persecution, could such a charge be justly founded on the denial of sites. And, at any rate, for all the inconveniences that may have been felt, *they* are responsible who seduced members from the Establisment, while it held the Headship of Christ, and every other vital doctrine of Christianity; and I cannot help adding, that at the door of the same parties, lies the *guilt* of telling the people rather to stay in their homes, than attend ordinances in the parish Church, where a pure Gospel was all the while preached, without money, and without price.

That there has been the manifestation of a persecuting spirit, and that there has been something like actual persecution on the other side, it will not be difficult to show. Consider for a moment, the principle which usually dictated the selection of sites. Generally speaking, when this could be managed, they were chosen as near as possible to the parish Church. There is no part of Scotland where the traveller may not verify this statement by his own observation, and that whether in town or country. Glasgow, perhaps presents the only exception. There, no Free Church has been erected eastward of the Molendinar Burn. There, some of the Seceding Ministers, leaving the poor degraded inhabitants of their former parishes to the care of their "Erastian" successors, have planted their Churches in the heart of the wealth of Glasgow, where, on one favoured height, four of them may be seen in a cluster, in the immediate vicinity of other dissenting churches. Thus have they committed the very sin, on account of which they had lately so sternly rebuked the far more consistent Voluntaries. At Lochwinnoch, the Free Church has been built in the field adjoining that on which the parish Church stands, although a fully more eligible site, and on more moderate terms, could have been had a little way off. At Govan, an unsuccessful, though strong effort, was made to purchase a site close to the entrance to the parish Church. At Cardross, in Dunbartonshire, the Free Church was erected before any congregation was gathered, and as close to the parish Church as it could possibly be, although, three miles off, there is a village of 2500 inhabitants, where, had the sole object been the edification and convenience of the people, the new place of worship would undoubtedly have been planted. In like manner, at Kirkliston, in Linlithgowshire, the Free Church is within pistol-shot of the parish Church, although within the parish there are the villages of Newbridge, Clifton, and Winchburgh, where an additional place of worship might have been useful.

People have remarked, that the Free Churches generally have been placed in parishes already enjoying the advantages of a faithful and zealous gospel-ministry, rather than in less cultivated parts of the vineyard; and provided the parish ministers had gone certain lengths with the Non-Intrusion party, the most zealous efforts have been made to alienate from them the affections of an attached people. I have by me a long list of Free Churches, unnecessarily placed near to the parish Churches: but the fact is too notorious to require to be dwelt upon. I shall simply append a letter on the subject, from a highly respectable clergyman in the North Highlands:—

"Some of the leaders of the New Secession have publicly maintained, that there was no desire entertained, or effort made, to have the new Church erected near the parish Churches. Now, the very reverse is the truth, in this part of the country, well as in other parts of Scotland. It would be ea to name parishes, in which the parish Churches a situated very inconveniently for the populatio and yet the new Seceders, and their deluded follo ers, have insisted on building within a few yards the parish Churches, and *refused sites* that we offered to them in the most convenient localiti that could be pointed out. Their object was to a noy and terrify the parish Ministers and their co gregations. If any one deny this statement, p rishes could be named; and in which there are S ceding Ministers, and people whose conduct towar their parish Ministers, and people in the immedia neighbourhood of the parish Churches, and *on t Lord's day*, will show what manner of spirit they a of, and who is the master that they serve."

Passing from the sites, let us allude in general the persecuting spirit which, in consequence of th ignorance of the people, and the proportionall greater influence of the Seceding Ministers, has bee more fully developed in the Northern Counties tha in any other part of Scotland. The following stat ments have been fully authenticated by a person the utmost respectability, having the best means being informed:—

"Exclusive dealing has been had recourse to numberless instances, in order to *coerce* persons business to join the Free Church. Innkeepers, sho keepers, tradesmen, could be named in the towns Invergordon, Evanton, Tain, and many other place who confess in private that they have joined the Fr Church against their judgment and inclination, an merely from fear that the threats of their bein ruined in business would prove too true, if they d not join it. How far their private acknowledgmen ought to be relied on, under such circumstance may be a question. Certainly, those persons wh act against their judgment and convictions of dut from mere worldly considerations, act a most u worthy part. In courts of justice, however, the evi dence of even criminals is received, though it is fo the jury to decide, from the whole circumstance what degree of weight is due to it.

"Deeds of violence have been, in multiplied i stances had recourse to, on the part of the mo zealous and furious of the New Seceders. Two me residing at Bogbain, in the Parish of Tain, pursue Mr. Ross of Hartfield, aged 74 years, on the 10th April last; and had nearly made an end of him, f no other reason than that he continued in the E tablishment. It was no private pique, for they ha never seen the worthy gentleman till he was pointe out to them, in the evening of that day. Justice however, overtook them, and they were punishe with an imprisonment of six months. In Octob last, three men in the Parish of Kincardine, name George Ross, aged 82, William Ross, his son, an James M'Lennen, his grandson, were attacked o their way home from a cattle-market, by two me who cruelly maltreated them, lots of people lookin on and rejoicing in the drubbing which the wicke *Moderates* were getting. There was no cause wha ever, according to every account, for this assault, b the enmity of the *self-glorifying Seceders* against th peace-loving people of the Establishment. The ca was brought before the Civil authorities, whose d cision has not yet been given. In autumn last, ploughman, in Easter Ross, rose from his bed o

ning, for the purpose of attacking two clergymen the Establishment, who happened to be dining in neighbourhood. When he entered the house, he de no secret of his designs. The family and their est were then engaged in worship; and it was by application of physical force that he was pre- ted from completing his wicked purpose.

" The Parish School-house of Clyne, in Suther- nd, was lately attacked; and Miss Bruce, sister of e schoolmaster, was nearly killed in her bed, by nes projected at her through a window. About e same time, stones were thrown in through the ndow of a house in the Parish of Rogart, and the ndlord was hit while he was on his knees with his mily around him, worshipping the God of the fa- lies of Israel. In October, last year, a band of ffians attacked the cottage of an aged couple, (each out 80) at Kincardine, and threw large stones rough the window. There was no personal injury ne to the inmates, farther than that they got a ght. But their window was broken, and it was e boards of their bed that protected them. In the urse of last spring, Mr. M'Iver, Minister of Dor- ch, went to visit a school in the parish. *All* the ildren were of the Secession. Whenever *he* went to the school, *they* went out. He remained a hile within, conversing with the teacher. At last, and the teacher went out together; and when ey did so, the scholars attacked them with stones, , so that both minister and teacher had to make eir escape from the fury of the urchins."*

* The Committee of the Free Assembly that met in 1843, to dress the Ross-shire people, in reference to the riotous pro- dings which had disgraced various parishes of the county, blished an address, in which it was asserted that the riots peared to have been the result of a refusal on the part of ded proprietors to grant sites for churches. In making this ertion, the Committee must have proceeded on information ich they received from parties erroneously deemed by them serving of credit. The riots were chiefly in the parishes of sskeen and Resolis, and in those two parishes sites had been *eviously* granted—in Rosskeen, by Mr. M'Leod of Cadboll, d in Resolis, by Sir George Gunn Munro of Poyntzfield. As the riots themselves, some of the Ross-shire ministers stated the Free Assembly, which met at Glasgow, (as reported in the wspapers,) that all the damage done by them was the breaking the crown of an old hat, and that not a drop of blood had been lt. That the case was far otherwise, the following extract from letter addressed to the author, by a worthy clergyman of that untry, will enable the reader to judge. " It is matter beyond ntradiction, that a man of the name of Harvey from Cromarty, d soon after the riots in consequence of the injuries he had ceived at Resolis, in maintaining the peace, and the County of ss, at their meeting, on the 30th of April last, did, on the mo- n of General Sir Hugh Fraser, allow L.10 to Mrs. Harvey and r family, as a small acknowledgment of the regret of the Coun- Gentlemen for the loss the widow and orphans had sustained. is likewise a matter beyond contradiction, that Lieut. Thom- n, R.N., who commanded the coast-guard at Resolis, was so se- rely injured, that he was for a length of time confined in con- quence, and that the wounds he received have disabled him r farther service. Hence, at the Michaelmas county meeting, was agreed to petition Government to confer upon him some situation not requiring great bodily exertion. It is farther un- eniable, that it was the landing of 150 Irishmen of the 87th giment at Invergordon that was the first mean of curbing the otous and fiendish spirit that prevailed in Ross-shire in Sep- mber and October 1843.

Will it be credited, that, in the face of these undoubted facts, r. Candlish, at the meeting of his Presbytery, held on the 5th February 1845, ventured to say—" A great movement had ken place, affecting the religious welfare of the people of Scot- nd. It had taken place without any breach of public order. had been accomplished *without tumult, riot, or disorder!*" On e same occasion, Mr. Guthrie, in his usual felicitous style, ought proper to denominate the Evangelical Clergy of the hurch, " Evangelical Apostates," " Blood Suckers," and " The complished Scholars of a dexterous Master." Even Dr. Cla- *horresco referens!* could sit and listen to these gentlemen,

I have no doubt there are many in the Free Church who would concur in cordial disapprobation of such conduct—but it is just the practical improvement of those discourses, speeches, and tracts, by which the minds of young and old were poisoned; and by persons of whom, from their station and previous character, other things might have been expected.

Neutral parties have, it may here be remarked, not been indifferent spectators of the usage received more especially by the ministers of the Establishment from their former brethren. An intelligent Dissenter thus writes:—" Another part of the proceedings of the Free Protesting Church is, the treatment which they are giving to their brethren with whom they were so lately associated in the Establishment. They are displaying by far too furious and relentless a spirit towards them. We are not aware that the Scottish Church differs in any material respect from what it was when they themselves were so loud in its praises. So far as we can perceive, it enjoys still all the advantages on account of which they extolled it. The law of patronage is the same as it has been for considerably upwards of a hundred years. If there be any difference, it is rather more relaxed in favour of the people than formerly. They say that it has become an Erastian Church. It is not more Erastian than formerly, for its constitution has undergone no change. But admitting all that they say about the Erastianism of the Church which they have left to be true, this is no reason why they should use such strong language in speaking of the ministrations ef those who still adhere to that Church. There are still connected with the Establishment many excellent men and able ministers of the New Testament—men who preach the Gospel, and who labour assiduously among their flocks; and to speak, as if it were scarcely possible that persons could be saved within the pale of the Establishment, is language altogether indefensible. In so far as the obtaining of salvation is concerned, we do not see what difference there is between those who remain in the Establishment now, and those who adhered to it before the Protesters left it."—*United Secession Magazine*, September, 1843.*

2. *Spoliation.* The charge of spoliation is based on what has occurred in regard to certain Churches and Schools, erected by voluntary subscription during the last ten or twelve years, and to which it is willingly conceded that very considerable contri-

while in the garb of Christian Ministers, they thus seemed resolved to rival the great Irish " Martyr" himself, in bold assertions and coarse abuse. Not only so, but he actually declares that " he rejoiced *at the calm and conciliatory spirit*" which his brethren had displayed in the course of the discussion! *Scottish Guardian*, 11th Feb. 1845.

" Cadme quid hoc? Ubi pes? Ubi sunt humerique manusque
Et color et facies, et dum loquor omnia."

OVID.—*Metamorph.* Lib. iv. Fab. xvi

O Cadmus! where's thy foot and where thy hand?
Thy neck so graceful, and thy looks so bland?
Ye powers! he changes every glance I take:
Ah! now—I've lost him—O, that frightful snake.

* An aged individual, who had been all along a Dissenter, lately applied for admission to the Lord's Supper in one of the Parish Churches of Glasgow. When asked by the clergyman, (from whom I have the account,) what his reason was for this change? he replied—" Never was there a Church so abused as the auld Kirk has been for some time past, nor, in my opinion, more unjustly. I admire the forbearance and meekness that have been shown in return, and have made up my mind to cast in my lot with the Establishment during the remainder of my days."

butions came from parties now in the ranks of the Secession. Did not the Seceders state very distinctly in their Protest, that all questions of Civil right—all temporal matters, they willingly conceded to the Civil Courts, for their determination, by which they would implicitly abide? Surely, they will not allege, that there is under the New Testament dispensation such a holiness in the *fabrics* of Churches, as ought to place them beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts of law, and to exclude these Courts from judicially deciding to whom the fabrics belong. This being granted, the question arises, what were the intentions of the contributors at the time when their contributions were given? It is undeniable that they had no idea of seceding *then*. The principle of Establishments was then of paramount importance with them. Those who opposed it were rather severely handled, being represented as atheistical, or as denying the Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ. The parochial system was *then* lauded to the skies, as the only means of evangelizing a country, and much labour was expended in showing the wretched condition of America, in consequence of there being no Established Church there. Such being the views of those zealously embarked in the cause of Church and School extension, they took care to have it fixed and settled, *by receiving grants from the State*, and by the terms of the title-deeds and constitutions obtained, that both Churches and Schools should be inalienably connected with the State, and in all time coming be placed under the superintendence and control of the *parochial clergy*. Had the "Free Contributors" become Roman Catholics, would they have ventured to transfer the said Churches and Schools to the Romish Church, and to the superintendence and control of the Romish Priesthood? In such a case, or in the event of their having become Quakers, Socinians, Mahometans, or worshippers of Baal, they would have had as valid a title to seize the fabrics, as that to which they now lay claim, as members of the Free Protesting Church. But in almost every case, when the Minister of a *Quoad Sacra* Church seceded, he acted upon the principle that he had a perfect right to carry his Church along with him.

It is certainly but just, that all *bona fide* debts, contracted in the erection of such Churches and Schools, should remain as burdens upon them when they revert to the Establishment. But who can wonder that the Church should deem it prudent to exercise a little caution before homologating debts which may be found not to have been *fairly* contracted? Did not a leading Seceder, when preparations were being made for "the Disruption," publicly recommend, that—"*The Quoad Sacra Churches should be loaded with debt to render them useless to the Establishment, on the same principle that the commander of a fortress, before abandoning it, takes care to have the guns spiked?*" Alas! is there no case in which the title-deeds have been *clandestinely altered*, for the purpose of robbing the Establishment of its rightful property? But the decision of the general question may be referred to the old Dissenters, in one of whose organs we have as follows:

"With respect to the Chapels and Schools built chiefly by that party of the Church of Scotland that now constitute the Free Church—these, I have no doubt, the Free Church never can obtain. But how is this? Why, before her emancipation, the Free Church took most especial care, and used every precaution, to have these very Chapels and Schools so firmly riveted to the Establishment, that no human power might ever be able to dissever the from it. This may teach her a lesson for the futu and it may teach others as well as her, not to act bigoted and selfish a part—but surely since she h self, by her own hands fabricated the chains whi bind these erections to the Establishment in perp tuity, she can produce but little reason, why any o should sympathize with her in her wailing over t loss of them."—*Relief Magazine*, No. lxxvi. p. 16

What language could be stronger than that whi was used by Dr. M'Farlan of Greenock at the Thi Annual Meeting of the Highland Church and Sch Society, at to the necessity of connecting the *fabr* with the Establishment: "So strongly do I feel this subject, that rather than this seminary shou not be permanently connected with our pure a venerable Establishment, *I would be content to this stately edifice in which we have assembled, a which our respected friend, the Treasurer, has cal a palace, levelled with the ground, and not one st of it remaining upon another.*"

Since the last edition of this pamphlet was pu lished, the Court of Session has decided that fr eighteen to twenty churches which the Free Chur party retained, after the Secession, belong to t Establisbment. In a learned note, Lord Roberts has given a luminous exposition of the princip on which the decision was founded, but from motiv most honourable to himself, his Lordship has a stained from casting any imputation on the pa whose claims have been set aside. But in a par lel instance of a chapel held by the Free Seceders England, the Vice Chancellor, Sir Thomas Bru who had had no concern with the Non-Intrusi strife, felt constrained to express himself as follow

"This is done in the cause of religion, of that r ligion which, under one dispensation, said '*thou sh not deal falsely, thou shalt not defraud thy neig bour;*' and, under another dispensation, '*whatsoe ye would that men should do unto you, do ye a unto them, for this is the law and the prophets.*' Th such a transaction should have taken place up any question merely civil, would create surprise a regret; but that it should have taken place in case where the question was as to the advancem of religion, is calculated to excite much strong observations."

Before concluding, let me add a few words for t purpose of guarding the preceding remarks fro misinterpretation. It was certainly not my inte tion to insinuate, that had the claims of the Conv cationists been conceded, the leaders would ha employed them to trample on the liberties of t lay subjects of the realm, and to re-enact such scen as unhappily occurred in the middle of the seve teenth century. Then, in too many cases, did t Presbyterian Church pry inquisitorially into t privacies of domestic life, exercising a dictation a tyranny which would not be submitted to in t present times, even for a moment. Then, takin cognisance of the members of other communion she visited with her anathemas all who would n conform to her faith and ritual, and even sometim compelled parties to swear to a Confession in whi they did not believe. The principles of toleratio are now better understood, and secured by expr statutes of the realm, so that such scenes could n be re-enacted, even although ecclesiastics shou have proposed this, which I by no means presu to insinuate they intended to do. I believe, h ever, and this is the idea I meant to convey, t

d the claims been conceded, the power of the urch would have been exercised by the leaders, as to oppress, in the most galling manner, all o might differ from them in questions of ecclesi- ical polity. Thus, was it not gravely proposed depose the whole Moderate party?

On another point referred to in the preceding ges, I wish likewise to guard my language from ng misunderstood. It was not my intention to rge the Seceders with the sin of having *con- ously* committed a breach of their ordination vs—but may not much sin be committed by par- s blinding themselves to the character of their ceedings, and even persuading themselves all the ile that they are doing God service? The Seces- n of 1843 might, when viewed in various lights, justly styled, the *sin of the century*, and the con- t of many of the Seceders has been such as to gust multitudes, and throw a stumbling-block in way of not a few. Still I do not charge them h a *wilful* violation of their ordination vows, al- ugh that charge has been very freely brought by he of them against Ministers of the Established urch.

Some plain statements have been made in the ceding pages, and to those who have been taking for granted that came from the Press or heated rtisans of the Free Church, they may possibly e offence; but nevertheless, they are "*Facts, not lsehoods*," and may be wholesome, although un- latable. I trust, however, that in setting them th, I have shown no spirit inconsistent with ristian charity, or with esteem and affection for ny of the Ministers and Members of the Free urch. An apology has, I observe, been made by ne of their leaders to the Churches holding Vo- ntary principles, for much of the language which s used during the heat of the Voluntary contro- sy, when it was too often forgotten, that the op- nents of Church Establishments might be Chris- n men, and, though mistaken, be sincere in hold- g the opinions they avowed. I have no doubt, in e manner, when the excitement of the present y is over, and when the righteous proceedings of e Church Courts, guarded, instead of being ques- ned by the Courts of Law, shall have revealed to e most prejudiced the honourable and Scriptural sition of the Establishment, regret will be felt d expressed for much that has been both said and ne in these unhappy times. The Church recently t the injurious consequences of receiving Dissent- ministers, of a particular persuasion, as a body o her communion. It is to be hoped, therefore, t while readily receiving back good men who had n seduced from her pale, she will be slow to lis- n to overtures from any who were active in the recent movements, and have since been running and fro slandering the Church and the clergy. ey have, as one of their ring-leaders remarked ile interrogated by the Voluntaries of America, Allied themselves to the great family of Dissent," d there let them remain.

It is not for us to pry into futurity, but it is sure- our duty to pray that the Secession, though sinful itself, though preceded and accompanied by so ny acts meriting condemnation, and whose con- uences have, in the meantime, been so deplor- e, may be ultimately overruled to the advance- nt of the Redeemer's Kingdom, and to the hast- ng of the glory of the latter day. Amen.

ADDENDA.

The following dialogue lately took place betwee an Esteemed Co-presbyter and one of the most re spectable of the new Seceders:—

FREE MINISTER.—"How does the Establishmen prosper in your quarter?"

ESTABLISHED MINISTER.—"Wonderfully well, a things considered, and daily improving."

FREE M.—"I am glad to hear it."

ESTAB. M.—"Can I believe my ears?"

FREE M.—"Yes, I repeat my words, and I hav all along rejoiced, when I heard of a vacancy i the Established Church being well filled up."

ESTAB. M.—"Pray then, how came you to secede?

FREE M.—"Because of *my pledge*, and for n other reason,—I could not bear the idea of bein held up to the public as a dishonoured man."

The above gentleman, in so far as the ground Secession is concerned, may be viewed as the repre sentative of a numerous class in the Free Church Persons so situated, if they took a right view their ordination vows, ought immediately to see re-admission to the Church of their Fathers. Veril if the ruler of the Free Church imagines, tha among those who seceded through his means, all contentment and peace, he is much mistaken, no would it do for him to indulge to much in sleep,—

Ου χρη παννυχιον ενδειν βουληφορον Ανδρα
Ωι λαοι τ' επιτετράφαται και τοσσα μεμηλε.—
Iliad., Lib. ii. v. 25.

To sleep in bed twelve hours will never do,
For one who rules such motely tribes as you.
On sand your thorny throne has its foundation,
In vain your subjects cry, *more sustentation.*

I have also had shown to me, by a gentlema deeply imterested in the Highlands, a number letters addressed to him by clergymen, and oth parties of the highest respectability, which farthe illustrate the spirit of the Seceders, and the baneff effects of the Secession in the remoter districts the country. Through his kindness, I have bee permitted to publish a few extracts:—

S——, *April* 1844.—"In common with most oth parts of Scotland, the late schism has done muc mischief among our once peaceable and orderly Hi brideans. It has given many of them, as if it wer another nature entirely; and has sown the seeds animosity and discord, even in families where the was formerly but peace and harmony. The Mini ters of the Establishment are denounced as being t Queen's Ministers, and not Christ's; as being tram lers of Christ's crown under foot; as being entire under the control of the Civil Courts, not being ab to depose a Minister, however irregular in his co duct, reject an unworthy communicant, or keep ba tism from the child of a profligate parent, und pain of chastisement from the Court of Session. will take time to dispel these delusions from th minds of an ignorant people, who have neither th knowledge, nor the mental discernment to see th fallacy inculcated upon them. But these thin cannot stand long, for a Church that depends for h support on abuse, falsehood, and calumny, cann from the nature of things succeed," &c.

"In the parish of S——, there are very few the Free, except in the remote districts of S——

where most of the people have been alienated from the Establishment by a violent Gaelic teacher.

"The Rev. Mr. M——— goes to S——to preach every third Sabbath. On a certain day, when he was riding to that district to preach the Gospel, he found the road crossed by a large dyke, and deep ditch, at a certain pass so that he could not get on his journey, until he turned back a certain distance, and got forward by a circuitous path. It was now found out, that this was the work of the "Free," for the purpose of intercepting the "Moderate" minister. The guilty were soon discovered, and punished by a fine.

"In B———, a number of scurrilous letters were anonymously addressed of late to respectable ladies, who were of the Established Church. This was done by a conclave of the 'Free.' One of the party turned King's evidence, and the whole plot was discovered, when the principal leader was severely fined, and chastised by the Sheriff in court.

"In S———, pins and needles have been frequently fixed in the pulpit-seat, and the window glass in the church and manse was broken, and all this the work of the 'Free.' Such proceedings are disgraceful, though common in all quarters where the 'Free' are numerous. The lower orders are instructed to associate the term 'Moderate,' (that is, a minister of the Establishment,) with everything filthy and degrading. I lately heard a gentleman say, that he went into the inn at Bracadale, and heard one servant maid calling on another, and asking, 'Did you throw out that basin of Moderate water?' On inquiry, the gentleman found, that everthing filthy was termed Moderate, whether pots, or pans, or water," &c.

G——. "The hatred which these people manifest to such as have remained in the Church, is most violent. They will scarcely speak to their most intimate acquaintances when they meet them, and take every opportunity of abusing them, and teach their children to bawl after them as they go to Church,—'There go the Black Moderates on their way to the Devil's house.'* With all this, there is mixed up a great deal of the spirit of radicalism. One of the preachers, or Gaelic catechists, 'declared, that he hoped to see the day, when there would not be a *white house* between H—— R—— and A———, and the people should have the land to themselves, and pay no rent.'"

C——, *April* 1844.—"Intimidation is still going on to a great extent, and exclusive dealing was, until very lately, openly recommended from the Secession pulpits."

* The above appellation was often given to the Parish Church in the Lowlands likewise. Soon after the Secession, any one known to belong to the Establishment, in passing through a certain Royal Burgh of the West, was sure to hear the following lines, which the Free Church children had been instructed to sing in the street, with respect to the Parish Church, from which one of the sourest of the Seceders had taken his departure:—

The Walls are thick,
The Folks are thin;
The Lord's gaen out,
The Deil's come in.

K——, *April*, 1844.—"The state of feeling wards the adherents to the Established Church most dreadful and unchristian on the part of 'Free Church' folk. It has come the length of joicing at the death or calamity of Established nisters and their followers. The bitterest and m rancorous hatred seems to reign in their boso The nearest relatives don't speak to the adheri relatives; and Free Churchmen have no hesitati in consigning to eternal flames *all* indiscriminat who differ from them. In fact, in this neighbo hood, a Free Churchman considers himself sure heaven, because he is a Free Churchman. John, Established Churchman, says to Sandy, a F Churchman, 'I am sorry you left the Church your fathers—the good old Church of Scotla 'O John, John, you are but a devil for remain in the old Church. God has left it, but my nister tells me, I am sure of glory, because I h signed!'"

ACCOUNT OF A BAPTISM IN LOCHABER.

After a series of solemn groans, he proceeded follows—"Och my brethren, here is water—water a basin, wherewith to perform the holy ordinan The Queen, and the Parliament, and the landlor have done what they could to take Christ from y but they cannot take away water. They would so if they could, but the Lochy could not be dri by them all. They cannot make water run mountains!"

Many most extraordinary scenes have been ena ed and extraordinary things said by Gaelic ministe of the Free Church, not only in dispensing baptis but in fencing the tables before the communio also in celebrating marriage, and on funeral oc sions; but I feel that I have inserted enough for t purpose I had in view. A faithful record of the has, however, been kept, and it is understood th they will ere long be presented to the public by gentleman of great intelligence and undoubted ch racter, in a pamphlet preparing for the press.

Such a work would doubtless present certain Ga lic "Apostles" in an extraordinary light, but inc culable would the benefit be, were the result energetic movement on the part of the Church, conjunction with the landed proprietors of the Hig lands, to rescue, by means of an extended educ tional and missionary instrumentality, that m interesting part of our beloved country from t influence of those fanatical and unscrupulous teac ers, who taking advantage of that very ignoran for which themselves are largely responsible, seduc so many of the poor and confiding inhabitants fro the Church of Scotland, and filled them with host lity to their natural protectors, and to the instit tions of the country.

The names of persons and places would have bee inserted, but for the consideration, that thus t personal safety of respectable parties might ha been endangered, in a state of society not unlik that of the South of Ireland.

WILLIAM MACPHAIL, PRINTER, GREENSIDE PLACE.

CHURCH PAMPHLETS.

NOW READY,

IN ONE VOLUME OCTAVO, HALF-BOUND CALF.

PRICE, 15s. 6d.,

PAMPHLETS IN DEFENCE OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

SINCE THE SECESSION OF 1843 TO THE PRESENT TIME.

JUST PUBLISHED,

1. An Answer to the Protest of the Free Church, Prepared in Consequence of a Challenge from an Elder of that Church. By a Minister of the Establishment. Second Thousand. Price Sixpence.
2. Free Churchism. Price Twopence.
3. The Claim, Declaration, and Protest, of the General Assembly of 1842, Subversive of the Authority of Christ as respects the Church of Scotland, and of the Spiritual Rights of Members. Price Fourpence.
4. A Plea for the Divine Right of the Church of Scotland, as an Orthodox National Communion. Price Sixpence.
5. In What Respect is the Established Church of Scotland Changed? or, an Attempt to Shew that it still possesses its Vital Principles Entire. Second Thousand. Price Three-halfpence.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

6. Letters to the People of Canobie. By a Parishioner.

   Letter I. Spiritual Independence. | Letter III. Dissent.
   II. Patronage. | IV. The Spirit of Free Presbyterianism.

7. The Churchman's Catechism on the Headship and Kingdom of Christ. Fourth Thousand. Price Three-Halfpence.
8. Supplement to the Churchman's Catechism on the Headship of Christ, Referring more particularly to Questions involved in the Recent Controversies in Scotland. By an Elder. Price 3d.
9. The Veto Church, or, what is Non-Intrusion? Second Thousand. Price 2d.
10. The Popery of Spiritual Independence. Being a Sequel to the Veto Church. Second Thousand. Price 3d.
11. The Querist, not Bishop Berkely.—Four Thousand, Price Three-Halfpence.

    "The ablest of all the Pamphlets on the Church Question."—*Edinburgh Advertiser.*

12. Reasons of Adherence to the Established Church. Addressed by a Minister to his Parishioners.—Twelfth Thousand. Price Twopence.
13. The Established Church of Scotland, The Truly Free Church, and Friend of the People.—Ninth Thousand. Price Three-halfpence.
14. The Kernel of the Controversy, or the Church Question brought to a Point. By X. Y. Z.—Third Thousand. Price Threepence.
15. The Kernel Farther Discussed; or The Convocation Resolutions Based on Erroneous Doctrine. Second Thousand. Price Fourpence.
16. The Truth Explained: being an Examination of the Principles which the Free Church has Espoused; and a Vindication of those on which the Church of Scotland was, and continues to be, Established. By the Rev. George Smith, Minister of Birse. Price Fourpence.
17. Sayings and Doings of the Free Church Orators, being an Address to Orkney. By One of Themselves.—Fourth Thousand. Price Threepence.
18. Sutherland and the Sutherlanders; their Religious and Social Condition; or, the Duties of the Church and the Chieftain.—Second Thousand. Price Sixpence.
19. Speech of the Rev. Hugh M'Neill, at the Great Meeting in Exeter Hall, 10th May 1843. Price Threepence.
20. The Church in Orkney.—Address of a Minister to the Members of the Established Church, on the late Secession. Price Three-halfpence.

PUBLISHED BY MYLES MACPHAIL, SOUTH ST. DAVID STREET.